REPORT RESUMES

ED 003 518 08

LABOR AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF LABOR REPRESENTATIVES HELD AT KELLOGG CENTER FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN, SEPTEMBER 8 - 10, 1965.

BY- HOEHLER, FRED K., JR. AND OTHERS
MICHIGAN ST. UNIV., EAST LANSING
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-0130 PUB DATE SEP 65
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$2.52 63P.

DESCRIPTORS- *VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS, *LABOR UNIONS, MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT, *CONFERENCES, *ADVISORY COMMITTEES, *STATE PROGRAMS, EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN, KELLOGG CENTER, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

A CONFERENCE OF LABOR LEADERS AND MEMBERS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BOARDS AND ADVISORY COUNCILS MET FOR A 3-DAY CONFERENCE. THERE WERE 91 PARTICIPANTS FROM 30 STATES. EDUCATORS AND LABOR ORGANIZATION EXECUTIVES PRESENTED ADDRESSES ON THE FOLLOWING TOPICS--(1) PUBLIC EDUCATION IN AMERICA TODAY, (2) THE MEANING OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACTIONS IN THE STATE AND COMMUNITY, (3) FUNCTIONS OF AREA VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS, (4) NEW WAYS OF TRAINING FOR INDUSTRY, (5) DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, (6) THE STATE PLAN FROM "A TO Z," (7) LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, (8) THE JOBS OF THE LABOR REPRESENTATIVE, AND (10) MANPOWER TRAINING AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION. (JM)

ED003518

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

5-0130

LABOR AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF LABOR REPRESENTATIVES

HELD AT

KELLOGG CENTER FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

EAST LANSING

MICHIGAN

SEPTEMBER 8 - 10, 1965

CO-SPONSORED BY:

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, AFL-CIO

SCHOOL OF LABOR & INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

DIGEST

OF

SPEECHES

DISCUSSIONS

AND

PANEL PRESENTATIONS

Introduction

The passage of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 marked the beginning of some new directions in vocational and technical education. Among these is a requirement of broadly-representative state boards and advisory councils specifically for vocational education.

This conference was conceived for the purpose of providing background information and perspectives on vocational education for labor representatives chosen to serve on these state boards and advisory councils.

In addition, the chief officers of the AFL-CIO state labor councils were invited because of the leadership positions in each of the 50 states.

The conference was a cooperative venture of the U.S. Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Education Department of the AFL-CIO in Washington, D.C.; and the School of Labor and Industrial Relations at Michigan State University.

It was made possible by a training grant to Michigan State University from the U.S. Office of Education under the terms of Section 4 (c) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

There were 91 participants in the conference from 30 states and the District of Columbia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Program

Public Education in America Today 1

The Meaning of the 1963 Act 5

Vocational Education in Action -- In the State and In the Community 16

Discussion on Functions of Area Vocational Schools 23

Discussion on New Ways of Training for Industry 24

Discussion on the Disadvantaged Youth 25

Discussion on the State Plan From A to Z 28

Leadership Development in Vocational Education 31

The Job of the Labor Representative 38

Manpower Training and Vocational Education 45

List of Conference Participants . . . . Appendix

Conference Program

Kellogg Center
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan
Sept. 8 - 10, 1965

LABOR AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

WEDNESDAY, SEPT. 8

4:00 P.M. REGISTRATION - Kellogg Center

6:00 P.M. DINNER MEETING - (Centennial Room)

Chairman: Fred K. Hoehler, Jr., Associate Director
School of Labor and Industrial Relations

Welcoming Speeches:

Louis L. McQuitty, Dean, College of Social Science, Michigan State University

Peter Schoemann, President, United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry, AFL-CIO, and Chairman, AFL-CIO Committee on Education

August Scholle, President, Michigan State AFL-CIO

Address: PUBLIC EDUCATION IN AMERICA TODAY

Owen B. Kiernan, Commissioner of Education,
State of Massachusetts

THURSDAY, SEPT. 9

NEW DIRECTIONS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

9:00 - 10:30 A.M. THE MEANING OF THE 1963 ACT (Room 101)

Chairman: Sylvia McCollum, Program Planning Officer,
Division of Adult and Vocational Research,
U.S Office of Education

Panel members: Walter Arnold, Director,
Division of Vocational and Technical Education,
U.S. Office of Education

Lawrence Rogin, Director,
Department of Education, AFL-CIO

Russell Allen, Associate Professor,
School of Labor and Industrial Relations

10:30 - 11:00 A.M. COFFEE BREAK

Thursday, Sept. 9 (cont'd.)

11:00 - 12:30 P.M. DISCUSSION GROUPS

Group 1 FUNCTIONS OF AREA VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS (Room 102)

Chairman: Fred Irwin, Assistant to the President,
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO

Consultant: Michael Russo, Program Specialist, Division of Adult
and Vocational Research, U.S. Office of Education

Group 2 NEW WAYS OF TRAINING FOR INDUSTRY (Room 104A)

Chairman: Joseph Tuma, Executive Consultant,
Michigan Office of Economic Opportunity

Consultant: Edwin L. Rumpf, Ass't. Deputy Director,
Division of Vocational and Technical Education,
U.S. Office of Education

Group 3 TRAINING THE DISADVANTAGED YOUTH (Room 104B)

Chairman: Fred K. Hoehler, Jr., Associate Director,
School of Labor and Industrial Relations

Consultant: Barbara Kemp, Program Specialist,
Division of Vocational and Technical Education,
U.S. Office of Education

2:00 - 3:30 P.M. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN ACTION
--IN THE STATE AND IN THE COMMUNITY (Room 101)

Chairman: Otto Pragan, Assistant Director,
Department of Education, AFL-CIO

Panel Members: J.W. Letson, Superintendent of Schools,
Atlanta, Georgia

George A. Parkinson, Director
Vocational, Technical, and Adult Schools,
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Robert M. Worthington, Director of Vocational
Education, State of New Jersey

3:30 - 4:00 P.M. COFFEE BREAK

Thursday, Sept. 9 (cont'd.)

4:00 - 5:00 P.M. DISCUSSION GROUPS

THE "STATE PLAN" FROM A TO Z

Discussion leaders:

Group 1 - Sylvia McCollum (Room 102)

Group 2 - Otto Pragan (Room 104A)

Group 3 - Russell Allen (Room 104B)

5:00 - 5:30 P.M. REPORTS FROM DISCUSSION GROUPS (Room 101)

6:00 P.M. DINNER MEETING (Centennial Room)

Chairman: Nelson J. Edwards, Executive Board Member At-Large, UAW, & Member, Natl. Advisory Council on Vocational Education

Address: LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Dr. Ralph Wenrich, Professor,
School of Education,
University of Michigan

9:00 P.M. SOCIAL

FRIDAY, SEPT. 10

9:00 - 11:00 A.M. THE JOB OF THE LABOR REPRESENTATIVE (Room 101)

Chairman: Walter Arnold, Director,
Division of Vocational and Technical Education,
U.S. Office of Education

Panel members: Edwin C. Brown, Secretary-Treasurer,
Rhode Island AFL-CIO

Byrl Shoemaker, Director of Vocational
Education, State of Ohio

Otto Pragan, Assistant Director,
Department of Education, AFL-CIO

11:30 A.M. LUNCHEON MEETING (Centennial Room)

Chairman: Jack Stieber, Director,
School of Labor & Industrial Relations

Address: MANPOWER TRAINING AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Stanley Ruttenberg, Manpower Administrator,
U.S. Department of Labor

1:30 P.M. CONFERENCE ADJOURNMENT

Wednesday, September 8, 1965

Welcoming speeches were delivered by Louis L. McQuitty, Dean, College of Social Science, Michigan State University and Otto Pragan, Assistant Director, Department of Education, AFL-CIO standing, in for Peter Schoemann, Chairman, AFL-CIO Committee on Education. A speech of welcome from Michigan State AFL-CIO was delivered by the President of that body, August Scholle.

PUBLIC EDUCATION IN AMERICA TODAY

Abstract of the presentation given by Owen B. Kiernan, Commissioner of Education, State of Massachusettts.

For your consideration in the conference I would like to suggest two divisions: First, what vocational education is not, and then closing out with what vocational education is. First, it is not a thing of the past. A commonly accepted definition of vocational education is: a program of education organized to prepare the learner for entrance into a particular chosen vocation or to upgrade employment workers, whether they are steel workers or pipe fitters, whatever the field. This was the reason back in 1917 at least, when the Smith-Hughes Act went on the books, and I think as you go down through the years and check George Barden and the extension of the N.D.E.A. and the others, you will note that there is this training of individuals to render a significant service to society through the several trades, jobs or professions. The narrowness of the original definition is immediately apparent in 1965. What is more tragic, however, is the implication of what Shakespeare might have described as "a thing of the past." Unfortunately there have been many in the field of vocational education who prefer a state of separatism and actually nourish it. They have been abetted by academic teachers who look down long noses at those imposters who dare to invade the academic arena. To demonstrate the alleged incompatability between the two groups I recall a letter which I received from a teacher in the business field, in business subjects who decried the inclusion of business subjects under the 1963 Vocational Education Act. She wrote, "With their vocabularies (meaning the vocational teachers) limited as they are, I would find it most difficult to communicate with them." Now in spite of this extreme position, vocational education is now, and must continue to be, in the main stream of American education. It is not, nor should it be, solely manipulative or occupational in scope. To divorce it from a solid or basic or general education would make it barren indeed. There should be no real demarcation between general and vocational education.

Historically, there are several reasons for this reported wall of separatism. One is the indefensible rigidity with which the federal officials have interpreted the Smith-Hughes, the George Barden and the N.D.E.A., and all the other acts. Program flexibility and innovation have been blocked by a microscopic view of the punctuation marks and the statutory vocabulary of every new act which the Congress has passed. The purpose of the legislation is frequently overshadowed by hair-splitting interpretations.

Coupled with this federal idiosyncracy, and this is self-indictment, we found a fetish among state officials to place state plans in a straight-jacket and to respond to any new idea with a paternalistic pat on the head on the oft-repeated statement: "It can't be done. It's not according to the state plan." With the advent of each new state or federal act I pray nightly for adaptability and flexibility. Lawmakers on both levels, that is Capitol Hill and Washington, and as far as Boston is concerned--Beacon Hill, we pray nightly that they will give us elbow room for the interpretation of these new and far reaching acts.

Another probable reason for the separation of vocational and general education has been the sole identification of vocational education with our secondary schools. To many people in America today, the moment you mention vocational education, they think of a young person enrolled in a vocational or trade high school. They forget, perhaps as too many educators do, that vocational education has cradle to grave dimensions. An understanding and appreciation of the world of work should start in the primary grades, kindergarten isn't too early. And it should be carried forward through elementary, secondary, into the collegiate world and into the adult education world. Additionally, a plan to deemphasize the idea of terminal education is long overdue. Training and retraining are continuing needs all through life. And they do not cease at any arbitrary age or grade level. Truly significant vocational education permeates the ongoing programs of elementary schools, secondary schools, colleges and the adult education agencies.

Lastly, too many vocational schools have been regarded as exclusive or single purpose institutions. Such schools are relics of the past. Today all high schools *should be comprehensive, and* provide opportunities for development of specific vocational competence as well as preparation for normal post-high school education. A second feature or factor about vocational education in the negative, something that it isn't--it is not a path to second class citizenship. The fact that there are several tracks along which a student must select and develop his career potential suggests the importance of guidance. Unfortunately, too many of our counselors are obsessed with the college degree as a status symbol and have relegated those who chose the vocational track to second class citizenship. There can be little doubt that we have over-sold the value of college. And I say that on a renowned campus on the American collegiate scene. The resulting pressures to purchase "sheep skin prestige" for Tom, Dick, and Harry has caused the campus stampede of frightening dimensions.

It was John Gardner, our new Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary on the Cabinet in Washington, who reminded us that we're not invested by divine right to enter college any more than we are to run a 4-minute mile. All of us have been partners in a conspiracy to promote college enrollment as if it were the one and only pot of gold at the end of life's rainbow. In our enthusiasm to climb aboard the collegiate bandwagon and shout the slogan: "A college for everyone and everyone for college," we have inadvertently suggested that those who do not enroll really are destined to second class citizenship. Is it any wonder that parents fight for the preferred placement of their children on college campuses. Who are these conspirators? They represent the complete total spectrum of teaching and administrative personnel of our schools and colleges. I'm not suggesting that we develop any degrees of disloyalty to our profession. But, on a team basis, it seems to me that we have got to indicate to these young people what college can do and what college cannot do. And this involves guidance officials and principals and superintendants and deans and college presidents and commissioners of education and all of us who are in this great American educational enterprise. In de-emphasizing the prestige value of college, we have a parallel responsibility in reconvincing the public that human dignity and worth are not monopolies of the collegiate world. There are untold thousands in the "Mr. Chips category" who without formal college experience are making very significant contributions to our society. And this will continue to be the case. Also we have the responsibility to place the focus of public attention on the several alternatives to college. And, certainly, leading the list would be those post secondary pursuits which involve occupational, vocational and technical fields of endeavor.

Another item which vocational education is not - it is not hardware alone. Another common misconception about vocational education is that it does concern itself just with hardware. To many people, a vocational school is one large shop filled to overflowing with massive equipment and machinery. Unseen are the class rooms and laboratories for teaching the language arts, for science, for mathematics, and social studies. We need all of these in the advanced technology that we know today: in the defense services, health services, in industry, agriculture. Admittedly, some of the newer programs have deteriorated into "hardware purchastries" with little concern for the improvement of instruction. I must confess to visiting such a school recently, and I could not help but be impressed with the obvious lack of use of some bright and shiny equipment. I came away with the feeling that the machinery and hardware was there for show purposes only.

Lastly, vocational education is no longer a single community enterprise with notable exceptions such as Milwaukee or Atlanta or Springfield, Massachusetts. Vocational education has long since ceased to be a single community enterprise. Originally because of cost and enrollment factors only major cities sponsored vocational training of any consequence. It is true that they took in some students from the periphery or the adjacent communities, but even then these youngsters were given a rather low priority status as far as admission. Today, we have come to accept the regional concept although the movement has only recently gained real momentum. It bespeaks of an effective partnership involving several communities as well as the county, state, and federal participants. Occasionally, a single state with federal or foundation assistance will attempt a balanced program of vocational and technical education. North Carolina might be cited as a state in the vanguard of this particular movement. All of this suggests a productive dialogue involving several partners. And the same can certainly be said of laymen and professionals who owe allegiance to the local, state, and federal enterprises. Commendable as they may be, the monumental task ahead requires that lines of communication must be opened even wider. The dialogue also must include the users of our product: business, industrial leaders, heads of labor organizations, argiculture, the government, the military; all who offer job opportunities for our graduates. It was for these very reasons that the 88th Congress enacted the Vocational Education Act of 1963. As stated by President Johnson, the Smith-Hughes, and subsequent acts, were not broad enough or flexible enough, or rich enough to meet the needs of today much less the needs of tomorrow.

Let me close on a more positive note as to what vocational education is: it's an open-end system of education which provides a student and adult alike with training and retraining opportunities which provide for productive careers and purposeful citizenship. It's a system that can be geared to peacetime or wartime effort in meeting national crises. And it's contributions to the nation's welfare during World Wars I and II stand as a monumental achievement. It is a most promising way to solve the increasingly difficult drop-out problem of the one million youth presently out of school and out of work. A majority left non-vocational programs in which they exhibited limited aptitude and even less interest. It lends itself to a close liaison with industry, particularly in profitable work-study programs. And these have proved beneficial to all parties: the students, their families, higher education officials, and the industries themselves. It's a most appropriate vehicle for research and development in today's technology. With only a fraction of one percent being spent on this area, I think that you are all aware of the fact that industry customarily sets aside, or at least many of the major industries do, 10 percent for research and development; we have only a fraction of one percent in the field of education. And it is for that reason that it is rather significant that ten percent was earmarked in the Vocational Education Act of '63. It offers a means of continuing education not only to fit individuals for employment or re-employment, but for all with a vocational interest as well.

In conclusion, these items which we have listed, I think do demonstrate the great potential of vocational education now in the mid '60's and in the future. Let me return again to what John Gardner described as the toughest question facing the White House conferees. And that is whether we have courage, flexibility and imagination to innovate as the times require. Or whether we will continue to be members of the feet-draggers' club: to resist, to be reluctant to move forward. The very fact of this conference session in Michigan is proof of your willingness to get started and to face the issue squarely. Similar to the renowned quote of a great President which is on the wall behind me, "There is much work to be done."

* * *

Thursday, September 9, 1965 (Morning Session)

Chairman: Sylvia McCollum, Program Planning Officer, Division of Adult and Vocational Research, U.S. Office of Education

Panel Members: Walter Arnold, Director, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, U.S. Office of Education

Lawrence Rogin, Director, Department of Education, AFL-CIO

Russell Allen, Associate Professor, School of Labor and Industrial Relations

THE MEANING OF THE 1963 ACT

Walter Arnold, Director, Division of Vocational & Technical Education, U.S. Office of Education

I think that most of you know that federal aid to vocational education has been going on for almost 50 years now, beginning back in 1917 with the Smith-Hughes Act. Over the years there has been a series of subsequent acts chiefly increasing the aid and expanding the program somewhat, but by and large, following a pretty sharply drawn path of vocational education for young people and adults. We have come into this more recent era of the sixties with training and retraining programs in the new Vocational Education Act, or I might even say in the fifties with the Health Occupations Programs and the Technician Training Programs.

Admittedly, the program has had a rather limited range of training, a limited range in a number of respects, but it would not be accurate to say that it has gone down a rat hole. And I cite, very briefly, that a program which grew from serving a very few thousand people in 1917 to four and a half million people last year -- over half of whom were adults in classes designed for upgrading and updating people in their jobs, and more than 75% of the other half in secondary school programs which led to high school graduation -- would hardly be classified as pouring money down a "rat hole."

President Kennedy in his education message to the Congress in 1961 called upon the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to bring together from across the country a group of people representative of interests in vocational education, which as many of you know became known as the panel of consultants. The panel studied the program to the extent possible within a period of 12 months and reported back to the Secretary, the President and the Congress. Very briefly, they found that there was a great inadequacy of vocational education opportunities in this country. They found, for example, that less than 7% of high school students had some kind of opportunity for gainful occupational training. In regard to adults, there probably would not have been a much better percentage.

The general recommendation of the panel called for expansion and improvement of the program. And there is admittedly great need for improvement in vocational education, particularly with respect to the quality of the training. There are gaps and soft spots and weaknesses in vocational education all over the country. The recommendations of the panel of consultants led to the provisions in the new Vocational Education Act of 1963. Section I of the new Vocational Education Act States:

> "It is the purpose of this part to authorize Federal grants to States to assist them to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education, to develop new programs of vocational education, and to provide part-time employment for youths who need the earnings from such employment to continue their vocational training on a full-time basis, so that persons of all ages in all communities of the State--those in high school, those who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, those who have already entered the labor market but need to upgrade their skills or learn new ones, and those with special educational handicaps will have ready access to vocational training or retraining which is of high quality, which is realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, and which is suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit from such training."

There has been, I think, a rather common important misunderstanding about the philosophy of vocational education that any of you that have the time to study it would recognize at once. There are many people who are interested in vocational education today, who themselves define it very narrowly. If you trace back to the grand-daddies of vocational education, Charles Prosser and Charles Allen, and all of those who worked with them during the early part of the century, you will find nothing in their philosophy, nothing in their basic program that denies the importance of social and civic competence in vocational education. Now, one of the common things that is expounded from platforms is that vocational training or vocational education is a very narrow kind of education, that it is separate and that it trains in only a specific kind of manipulative skill with the barest amount of related technical knowledge. That is as false as can be! You have only to examine the history of the program to find that this is not true. That is not to say that it has not been some limitations in certain places, but by and large, among the people who have been active in vocational education, there has been a much broader concept of it.

Vocational education among the leading professionals in this country has always been recognized as an integral part of the public education program in this country. Whether it has been done well in every case or not is another question. It shouldn't be accepted that vocational education is a narrowly conceived kind of separate program in this country.

There are several important provisions in the new act which you will not find as such in the act. These have been culled out and analyzed. You will find many different specific parts of the act that refer to these several broad factors or provisions.

The first of these is that the programs are required now under law to be geared rather closely to the labor market demands and needs. You will find this pointed up not only in the law, but in the regulations and in the requirements placed upon the states to get into the business of vocational education under this Act. When I say geared to labor market needs, I am thinking of local needs, area needs, state needs, regional and national needs, and not only immediate needs, but future or projected needs. This is interpreted in the broadest sense.

Each state is required now, in addition to submitting a state plan, to submit what we call a projected activities program wherein they describe how they propose to use the money that comes to them and they give some explanation and justification of that use of the funds. In fact that state does not get a certification of money until that projected program is found to be acceptable. In support of this provision, the law requires, and this is why many of you are here, representation on the State board of people who are familiar with the vocational education needs from the viewpoint of labor and management. It also requires, and there is in action, a national advisory committee. That committee has met three or four times now. There is required an agreement between the state boards and the state employment service calling for an exchange of information between the two agencies: the employment service to provide information about the labor market situation, job openings, job requirements, skill and knowledge requirements of jobs that are available; and the schools, on the other hand, to provide information to the employment service about people who are coming out of the vocational education programs, their qualifications, interests, and so on.

Again, as in the past acts, the Vocational Education Act requires that the state board be the sole agency for the administering of the programs. There are some disadvantages in this provision but we ought to try to offset those by developing some different approaches and procedures. We have suffered a particular disadvantage in this country in connection with the program in the big cities because historically the big cities and the state boards have not had a close working relationship in vocational education. Many different efforts are being made to bring about a closer working relationship and hence, a better big city program than we have seen over the years.

A second important provision or factor which threads throughout the whole act is that now the whole spectrum of occupations other than the professions shall be considered for training program offerings. One of the limiting features of the old act was that the program was largely confined to the "skilled craft" occupations, both production and service; and of course, in the case of agriculture, the full-fledged farmer, which by law necessarily created a fairly narrow or limiting path for use of the funds. Now under the new Act any occupation, other than those which the Commissioner is required to designate as professional, is eligible for use of the funds. That means then that jobs, of even the least skill requirements can be considered for organizing training on up to the most highly skilled technical jobs.

A third provision which ties closely with the second is that the new law provides for the training of persons of all levels of ability. Again one of the limitations of the older act was brought about by reason of the point I just made. If you were dealing with the more highly skilled occupations, then you had to be dealing with people who were of average ability or above and this necessarily created a narrow range of ability among people who could enter into training. With the opening up of the whole job spectrum, we have the opening up of training programs or offerings for persons of all levels of ability, from those least able persons on up to the most able. To bring this point home more forceably in the act, you find provisions for broadening the definitions of the occupational categories in the old acts, the Smith-Hughes and the George-Barden Acts. That is a broadening out beyond farming into all of the agricultural occupations including the increasing number of technical occupations in the field of agriculture. There is broadening of the trade and industrial field to include the lesser skilled occupations. For a number of years an analysis of the enrollments in the trade and industrial program in industrial education would disclose that about 75% of the day school enrollments were in 7 different occupations. The other 25% may have been scattered among 35 to 50 occupations. What I am saying here is that the new Act opens this up widely in terms of occupations and ability levels of people.

A fourth factor is that the programs can be provided in all kinds of institutions in this country, even private, now. One of the common misconceptions of the historic vocational education program, is that it was confined to the secondary school. And of course, that seemed to be verified by the fact that I related a little while ago that 75% of the day school enrollments were in secondary schools. The truth of the matter is that the program could always have been conducted in any kind of secondary or post-secondary institution. The new Act confirms this and also provides a state board with the authority to contract with private institutions, as well as working cooperatively with any public institution. The range of institutions in which the program can and does appear are: the comprehensive high school, the specialized technical vocational high school that is commonly found in the larger cities, the rapidly developing area schools all over the country, in secondary and post-secondary levels, the technical institute, junior and community colleges, and in fact, four year colleges and universities.

Two other points, very briefly, that the Act provides for I think are ones many of you will be and should be concerned with. One is the provision for the evaluation of the programs. There is being formed under the law a 12-person ad hoc evaluation group that will be required to report back to the Secretary of H.E.W. and the Congress on the progress of the program by January 1, 1968. The law further requires that there be an evaluation made at intervals of no longer than every 5 years thereafter.

The other important thing is the provision for research--that 10% of each annual appropriation be reserved for research, for professional training of teachers, supervisors and leaders, and for experimental, developmental pilot programs particularly on behalf of disadvantaged youth.

The appropriations have gone up tremendously. The Smith-Hughes, George-Barden Acts provided $57 million of federal funds annually. The new Act will move the authorization to $225 million more by next year. This year the appropriation that was just made by the Congress provides $177.5 million plus the $57 million. There is also provision for a work study program and for experimental residential schools.

In closing, I would like to say that the position of the Office of Education is toward what we are calling a total balanced program of vocational education. This is one which would carry out all of the new purposes specified in the Act: programs for secondary school age youngsters, for post-secondary school age youths, for adults, and for those having special needs or suffering educational handicaps or deficiencies. The big thing we are seeing administratively is a tremendous need for skill in coordinating all of the various programs that are coming into being at all levels and particularly at the federal level.

Lawrence Rogin, Director, Department of Education, AFL-CIO

If one talks about the attitudes of the AFL-CIO I think one has to say that our attention to vocational education comes out of a conscious decision that the government needed to play a much more important part in training in this country; that this decision arose in the early '50's in an unfriendly atmosphere to expansion of government activities. The attitude toward changing vocational education was only one part of this. It arose first, probably because of the shifting location of industry rising out of contracting of industry. Second, it arose out of the changing nature of jobs due to automation and technological change, and the general shift in the growth of employment possibilities from the traditional blue-collar to white-collar and service occupations. It arose thirdly, out of the recognition by the labor movement that there was a growing need for greater education in order to get and hold jobs of all kinds. Therefore, the government needed, with these great problems and with continuing unemployment, to pay attention to training and manpower policy in a much more forceful way not only with money, but also with planning. The legislation and labor's support of legislation reflected this.

The first instance, I suppose was, one would have to say, a bill that the labor movement was responsible for almost entirely: the Area Redevelopment Act, which came from those unions which were suffering contraction and shifts of industry and was supported by the legislators from those communities which were suffering and which did have in addition to all other kinds of information, other kinds of support, training support in it. Secondly, the Manpower Redevelopment and Training Act was a recognition of two things. First, that even in a full employment economy, it was necessary constantly to be concerned about training for job opportunities. And secondly, this was necessary in an economy in which full employment was far from achieved. Thirdly, in the training provisions of the Trade Adjustment Act: one responsibility of the government in this connection was that the workers who might be displaced deserved training and support. In the M.D.T.A. and the A.R.A. of course, it was training and support, not just training and this was differing from traditional vocational education. Now the Tariff Commission never understood this provision of the law in the Trades Adjustment Act and it hasn't worked, but it was part of the labor movement's concern in this. Fourth, the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Fifth, the Economic Opportunity Act, the so-called anti-poverty program. I submit that when we look at our responsibilities of the Vocational Education Act, we have to look at our responsibilities in relation to all of these Acts. These are all part of a package of trying to make intelligent use of the people who work in this country so that they can work at decent wages and decent jobs, and so the training gives them this kind of opportunity. We cannot separate any one out from any of the others. In the support of these programs the labor movement has never separated any one out from any of the others, even though in the administration of the specific acts some separation obviously is essential. Let me say also, in regard to changing vocational education, that I would not take quite the optimistic tone that Walter Arnold did. Starting in the 1950's the AFL in the very first merger convention, and particularly very strongly in 1957, the AFL-CIO asked for a review of vocational education as it was conducted in the United States at that time. There was a question in the minds of the labor movement at that time about vocational education that related to all of the questions that I have raised about what was happening to manpower. One particularly: Was vocational education being abused in an effort by some employers to destroy labor standards by overtraining in areas in which training wasn't necessary or by diluting jobs in other areas so that crafts were diluted? Secondly, had it become in many communities, particularly the large cities, a dumping ground for students in secondary education whom the academic instructors couldn't find a way to deal with? Thirdly, in the same connection, had it become so divorced from general education that the kinds of things which related to the non-training aspects of vocational education were non-existent or ineffectively taught (that is the civic and social responsibility, the English, the history, the citizenship). And finally: Was the kind of support that was given, adequate to the kind of job that needed to be done? For example, the big problem in trade extension, in upgrading and updating of skilled workers was the fact that there was no support for equipment, expensive equipment which was needed to do the kind of job that needed to be done. Many of you in the trades know that this led in many instances to the development of training facilities outside of vocational education to do this work because there was no money in vocational education.

When one changes a bill, and has an act of manpower policy and the government is very much involved in manpower, there is promise and there are problems. And at the beginning there is always more problems than there is promise. The promise is that we now have a tool that deals with the kinds of needs that our society has. We need to have a tool to help bring the Negro people in the United States into active participation in our economy, in our society, as quickly as possible for the sake of the society and for the sake of the group. Vocational education in its many forms can help be such a tool. This is a promise. We have a problem now, at this time--the so-called group of disadvantaged. The kinds of training traditional in vocational education when it was done best, that is that took the best people we could get and trained them for the skilled jobs where they are needed, aren't suitable for the so-called disadvantaged youth, whether they are economically or physically or mentally disadvantaged. We have an opportunity under the new law to develop the kind of training that can be helpful with regard to this. We have, on the one hand, in our society, the demand for highly skilled jobs, all the jobs around electronics and computers, and we have the opportunity now to build the schools and buy the equipment to do this kind of job properly. At the same time in this law we have the opportunity to deal with the most simple and difficult problems of the people least able to do these kinds of jobs. But we also have problems in relation to this. When you become flexible and when you become large, you have the problem of intelligent relation between the jobs being trained for and the job opportunities that exist. The problem of an effort to overtrain in many areas, the problem of dilution of jobs which becomes greater as there are more government sources available for this kind of thing. The problem of using training to destroy labor standards. The problem of finding these difficult kinds of teaching methods which we need. Now an easy answer to this and one which societies very often accept, and which many in our society are prepared to accept is, "Let's not take the challenge. If we don't put the government money into this, or if we restrict very rigidly the way it can be used, then we don't have to worry about whether training will be used to dilute jobs, because there won't be enough government training to matter." But it seems to me that the attitude of the labor movement has always been that we make progress by accepting challenges. And this is what we need to do with this legislation. And I am sure that the problems of the next two or three years are going to be much greater than what we see the progress to be.

The labor movement we have to say permitted the deterioration of vocational education in most communities. The labor movement did nothing to see that it was kept up to date, that it had adequate support. Now, an opportunity arises again, a fresh opportunity. It was the labor movement that put into the law the provision that job training had to be related to manpower needs. The committee of state directors of vocational education met with all officers of H.E.W. and tried to get it taken out. There is a fact that if we ignore locally means that the provision in the law is meaningless. We cannot take advantage of that provision in the law by using it to block training; we have to use that provision in the law to promote training where it's needed because that is why the provision was put in the law. Over the years many of us have become experts in looking at the problems of our own trade or craft and developing a relationship with vocational education which has been helpful in this regard, and very constructive in this regard. This new series of legislation and particularly this law gives us an opportunity to expand on the kind of cooperative relationship that has existed and look at training not only from the prospective of our own craft and our own industry, but from the perspective of the needs of society, which is all of the people that we represent or should represent.

Russell Allen, Associate Professor, School of Labor & Industrial Relations

My job here is to try to look at some of the public policy issues that seem to bear on the Vocational Education Act of 1963. It is important to remember what is meant when we talk about vocational education. We tend to be very much college-oriented when we think about our educational system. Some of this is unconscious, and some of it is a very conscious and deliberate policy. But if you look at the figures, you see that the educational system loses 35% of the young people by the end of high school--the drop-out problem. If you start out with 100 kids, by the end of high school, 35 of them are gone. Forty-five per cent of the high school graduates (or another 30) do not go on a day beyond high school graduation. So out of 100 youth, only 35 go on beyond high school for any kind of post-secondary education: college, technical or anything else. Then 40% of the college entrants fail to graduate from college, so you are down to about 20% (in round figures) of your 100, about 20 kids out of 100 who really make it all the way through college.

So what you are really talking about is: What are you going to do for the other 80%? are you going to give them the same kind of concern, the same kind of attention, are you going to spend the same kind of money on the 80% as we are spending on the 20%? And if you look at the people who come into the labor market without a Bachelor's degree, you will find that only 1 in 10 has any kind of specific vocational preparation excluding those people who do get the college degree. We hope to cut the drop-out rate and do something about all of these problems, but they are not going to change very much or very fast in the years ahead that are going to be most important to us.

If you look at the development of the high school and the history of education in this country, you will find that the role of the high school has changed rather substantially. It has not always been the way it is. As a matter of fact, in the whole area of vocational education the universities got into the field before the high schools did, because the high school as we know it today was not really organized at the time. In 1862, the Morrill Act set up the land-grant colleges, of which Michigan State claims to be the pioneer. Michigan State was organized in 1855, as was Pennsylvania State. The colleges were the first ones to get into the area of vocation education and they did it as a reaction against the rather exclusive academic orientation of the other universities. The purpose was to provide vocational training primarily in agriculture, but also in what was called then the mechanic arts--a part of the franchise that was neglected for a long time, but was there in the charter all the time.

When the high schools first developed, they really were college-preparatory institutions, pure and simple. In 1870, for example, 80% of the high school graduates went on to college. There were many private high schools at this time and their function was, purely and simply, college preparation. Obviously that changed. In fact, by 1940, only 15% of the high school graduates went on to college. The whole nature of the high school had changed. From a college preparatory institution it really became a kind of terminal education, but it wasn't recognized as such then, and it isn't recognized as such today. The curriculum was and is, to a very large extent, academic oriented--oriented toward college preparation. Some changes were made in this, in part stimulated by federal legislation, but in the major part stimulated by the needs in the communities to build some type of vocational education into the secondary school system. Mention has already been made of the basic pieces of legislation: The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 and the George-Barden Act in 1946. This made some dent on the role of the secondary school in vocational education, but still not very much. In the post-war period, the dissatisfaction with the whole structure, the whole emphasis, and the whole scope of vocational education in this country grew. I think it is to the great credit of the labor movement that it became the focal point and it became the voice for some positive proposals for remedial action.

You cannot really talk about the meaning of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 without talking about the manpower programs that were developed in the 1950's largely through the advocacy of the labor movement.

I would add one piece of legislation which was also championed by the labor movement--the Employment Act of 1946, which set as public policy the goal of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. This became sort of a dead letter on the books for a long period after 1946; and it was the accumulation of a number of problems that lead finally to a breakthrough in manpower programs and in vocational education.

There was a bad experience with unemployment in the post war period. Except for the Korean War we never really came very close to the goal of full employment, even if you define it as the economist would at the level of about 3%. It was only in the years right around the Korean conflict that we achieved this level of employment. This wa a nagging problem that the labor movement was much concerned with. The growing impact of technological change has been a problem and this was added to the bad unemployment experience: the fact that the productivity was increasing at an accelerating rate relentlessly year by year. This accentuated the problem of a high rate of unemployment. Finally, in the 1960's we had the tremendous increase in the labor force--the result of population factors--the post-war population boom. In fact, the rate of increase in the labor market will almost double in the 1960's over what it was in the 1950's. By the year 1970, one out of every three persons in the labor market will have entered the labor force in the 1960's. Think that by 1970 one person out of three will have come in during the preceeding 10 year period. We have also had the demand for new and different skills--the new technology and the implications that this has for education and training.

We got in this country some breakthroughs in manpower policies in the Area Redevelopment Act.

We are getting more recognition today of a structural unemployment because of the structure of occupations in the economy, another aspect of structural unemployment. This was recognized in the Trade Adjustment Act of 1962, as well as in the Area Redevelopment Act which was finally passed in 1961. You got recognition of the problem in the Manpower Development and Training Act in 1962, amended this year in the Manpower Act of 1965. And you also had a foreshadowing of some of the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. All of these are really related to the problem of education and training. But what we were really doing was putting the cart before the horse--we were talking about active Manpower policies before we had done something about the basic vocational, technical structure that had to cope with these training and educational problems. We got legislation in advance and did not do anything about vocational education. Now the plans were in the works, a presidential panel was working, and the ferment was there. But it hadn't really come to a head with legislation and didn't until the Act in 1963. This is why the Vocational Education Act is so pivotal. The goals of the Manpower Development and Training Act as they relate to training and education, which is a large part of it, the goals of the Poverty Program, to a great extent, cannot be achieved unless there is a basic and sound, solid vocational education structure. They all tie in to the Vocational Education Act.

All of the programs in vocational technical education as all programs in education generally have to be taken within the context of public policy with respect to civil rights. These problems are not going to hold still while we get ready to solve them. We must have equal treatment in employment, we must have equal access to employment, and probably the most difficult problem of all, we must have equal preparation to get into these programs. I think that all of these things can be read into the meanings of the 1963 Vocational Education Act without any strain. I think we have the opportunity to change the nature of preparation for the world of work; to make training and education available to all in the various stages of life. Vocational education has clearly come to the fore at least as far as the federal government is concerned. We have not yet had the kind of complementary action on the local and state level that has been indicated clearly by the federal government. Whether or not that comes about will determine how effective this legislation will be.

A second point I want to make here very briefly. Labor participation for the first time is built into the legislation. The labor movement has been fighting for all these things: for the Employment Act, for Area Redevelopment, for Manpower Development and Training. But in the Vocational Education Act labor participation is built into the law and into the regulations. I want to make a couple of quick cautions: The first one is not to define vocational and technical education too narrowly. That would be self-defeating. We have to really try to make young people employable in the broad sense and not employable only if a particular skill or a particular occupation happens to remain in existence. We have in the past perhaps asked too little of vocational education, but we may be on the verge of asking it to do too much at this point--to solve all of the problems: structural unemployment, technological changes, school drop-outs, everything. Suddenly we have discovered vocational education. We say that is the answer and that will take care of everything. We have to have this caution in mind: that although there are a lot of things that can be done, there are also some things that cannot be done by this instrumentality alone. We don't want to try to set up in the vocational, technical system a new kind of elite to take its place beside the college kind of elite--to skim off those kinds of people that are easiest to train, best prepared for vocational education, and say that we have then met the problem. What we will really be doing is setting up another category of privileged people to take their place with the college trained, and we have to guard against that.

Basically the opportunity we have here is to offer the same kind of concern for the 80% who will not go through college as we have been offering for the 20% and I would say that who but the labor movement should champion this cause.

A question and answer session followed which dealt with the following topics:

(1) the implications of the 1963 Act for apprenticeship training;

(2) the fiscal implications of the Act;

(3) the attitudes of the apprenticeable trades to vocational education in general;

(5) the need for labor participation and concern with all aspects of public education

(6) maximizing the whole package of federal legislation to reshape the educational enterprise; and

(7) the need for a new concept of work study programs.

Thursday, September 9, 1965 (Afternoon Session)

Chairman: Otto Pragan, Assistant Director, Department of Education, AFL-CIO

Panel Members: J.W. Letson, Superintendent of Schools, Atlanta, Georgia

George A. Parkinson, Director, Vocational, Technical, and Adult Schools, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Robert M. Worthington, Director, Vocational Education, State of New Jersey

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN ACTION -- IN THE STATE AND IN THE COMMUNITY

Chairman: Otto Pragan, Assistant Director, Department of Education, AFL-CIO

When we started in the morning we tried to find out about the new directions of vocational education which started with the 1963 Act, and also the relationship between this Act and the other training acts passed in the last five years by Congress. Then we went into smaller discussion groups and discussed some of the special problems like how to work with disadvantaged children, youth, the problem of area vocational schools, the specific problems of training for industry. Now let's take a look at vocational education in action in the state and in the community.

Robert M. Worthington; Director, Vocational Education, State of New Jersey

I was asked to talk today about the state of New Jersey primarily because this, of course, is the state that I am most familiar with at the present time. I would like to start by saying that New Jersey has historically been a leader. We are one of the smallest, but the most highly industrialized and the most densely populated state in the nation. So we have every problem that you could possibly think of in vocational education--every problem that the President's panel of consultants emphasized that we need to be thinking about. I would like to talk about some of the recommendations made to all of us in education by a blue ribbon panel of experts. They represented the labor movement, they represented business and industry, they represented education. They did a study throughout our state after reviewing very carefully the recommendations of President Kennedy's panel of consultants. Many of the things that they found out about our state are quite typical of the other 49 states of the nation. If we were to take a random sampling of those students enrolled in elementary education in New Jersey, we would find that for every 10 kids, 2 would not finish high school at all. Eight will earn a high school diploma. Four will continue their education and only two will finish college. The committee found that in this study of 304,000 pupils in our state educational system, fewer than 10,000 were enrolled in federally-reimbursed vocational education programs. While this low number of students were enrolled, New Jersey was still an industrial leader and still one of the richest states. We are not training enough students. We are only training about 3% of the students in vocational education in the secondary schools under the federally reimbursed program. We were one of the lowest states in percentage in the nation as far as training programs. The committee pointed out in our state that we were not making vocational education available to all the children of all the people in all points of the state. Our committee pointed out that in our state we must offer training opportunities to the 60% of the New Jersey youth who do not go to college. Now this is a tremendous challenge. Also the committee said we need to expand vocational training consistent with employment opportunities and economic trends. We need to provide programs with solid occupational foundations built on the knowledge of the present job opportunities and the projected future needs. We have had an excellent record in the past of training for job needs and we expect to maintain that. Also, we were strongly urged to make these training opportunities equally available to all regardless of race, sex, or place of residence. Our state, fortunately, has had a program that has been integrated for years and a very good fair employment practice law for years, long before the federal emphasis.

It is important to emphasize at this point that the New Jersey committee did not recognize any one type of organizational plan for good vocational education. As pointed out this morning, the 1963 Act does not recognize any one particular type of plan and at one of the panel discussions it was mentioned too that this can be in almost any type of a setting. Our committee recommended that we explore the possibility of putting vocational programs in comprehensive high schools, and expanding our specialized vocational technical schools, developing technical centers which would only do the technical training, letting the students take their academic and other courses in the regular high school. Also we were told to explore post technical high school institutes and junior and community colleges. I might say that in the organization of the vocational division at the state level in New Jersey, our Commissioner of Education has delegated to us the leadership in all programs involving occupations from the very lower levels of elementary school clear through the junior college. He wants us to develop a totally integrated program also involving the Manpower Training and all these programs, all pulled together and coordinated.

As I see it there are several things that we are trying to do that have been talked about many times in the nation, that have not necessarily been implemented. We have to pay more attention to introducing more people to the world of work at a lower age level than we have been doing. You may have recently seen an article by Seymour Wolfbein where he emphasized this important objective. Wolfbein, in addition to talking about the need to lower our study of occupations down to an elementary school level, also emphasized the groups of people we have to concern ourselves with in vocational education. And these are the groups that we are trying to reach now in our state. He mentioned groups such as young people that he felt we are not doing enough for. He also mentioned the American Negro who constitutes 10% of the labor force, but contributes 20% to the ranks of the unemployed. He also mentioned the older workers whose skills are obsolete under the impact of the new technology.

He mentioned the unskilled and the semi-skilled worker. He mentioned workers in industry that are especially affected by the large-scale technological change and workers in depressed areas. He also pointed out, as did President Kennedy's panel of consultants, that we need to be working harder to help the disadvantaged young person. Why should a state like New Jersey which has historically been a leader in vocational education, having started it before the Smith-Hughes law, be concerned about developing new kinds of programs? I think that we should be concerned because we have adopted, literally you might say, the principles that Francis Keppel has been expounding as Commissioner of Education. Commissioner Keppel says that first, training for work is a fundamental part of education. He also says, second, that education should reflect that economic and social conditions of the present and likely future trends. He said third, that vocational education should address itself not just to those who enjoy technical talents, but should stretch its dimensions to reach those for whom an education is an only hope for dignity and economic freedom. And finally, vocational education should promote an appreciation of ideas as well as practical performance. Vocational education should not be regarded as a substitute for a sound academic background but as an integrated part of a well rounded education.

As I see it our role as vocational educators at the state level is the place that we can do most today to help to expand vocational education by having a coordinated program and by helping the local schools and industries to promote these programs. One, we can scrap old ideas that don't work. Two, we are going to acquaint children early with the world of work. There is no reason at all why the kid in the K to 6 program should not be studying the man-made environment as well as the birds and the bees and the flowers. We want to provide more specialized guidance and counseling for students at all levels of our schools. We have made a study recently and find that despite the fact that only 40% of the students are going on to post high school education that the counselors in our schools are spending 75% to 80% of their time with that 40%. We in the reorganization of our vocational division put vocational guidance right up at the very top. We are starting an experimental program in 15 schools called introduction to occupations. This will be a team teaching approach. Teachers who are familiar with occupations, guidance counselors, people brought in from labor and industry to help young people understand the world of work in this introduction to occupations. We are also combining in this particular unit, at the state level, our public information program so that we can sell and develop a new image of vocational education in our state. We want to go down to the elementary level but we also want to introduce more pre-vocational exploratory programs in our schools. At the junior high level--we want to make these more up to date. We want every young person, boy or girl, to have an opportunity to explore the world of work; to have an opportunity to work with tools and materials regardless of where he is going to go in later life. We want to place strong emphasis on these pre-vocational programs so they can choose occupations, they can develop some broad basic skills that will apply to any occupation. In other words, they will develop a core of common skills that they might use in whatever occupation they might wind up in.

Also, we are attempting to initiate a program of action research; to promote research and get local schools to try new things. When we announced that we were going to start new programs, 325 school districts submitted proposals that they wanted to try new things. This variety of occupational programs which we are trying out on a one year basis will be evaluated very closely to determine their effectiveness. Another thing we are trying to do is to open more vocational occupational opportunities to girls now we know that one-third of the work force is female; we are trying to reorient some of our homemaking programs and make them occupational programs in food service industries, in hotel and motel service worker occupations. We are aware that we need to be more flexible in our program. Our state commissioner has encouraged us and helped us to develop a state plan which we think is much more flexible.

We have also in the field of the manpower development and training program initiated in the last 5 months about 11 million dollars of manpower development and training programs. We are going to start a skilled center in Newark which will train out-of-school youth and unemployed adults in 26 skills. Now these skills do not cover any of the apprenticable occupations but we are including basic education that these people, many of whom have migrated up from the south, may learn to read and write before they go into these programs. We are also starting a tri-county skills center in the southern part of the state for 250 people and another in the center part of the state for 300 more. The whole program we are developing is geared to provide occupational education at whatever level it is needed so that the person that is taking it can profit from it; can be a better, useful citizen in the state of New Jersey. He will be a supporting taxpayer and not on the relief roles.

J.W. Letson, Superintendent of Schools, Atlanta, Georgia

One of the satisfactions in any job concerned with public education is to see the growth and development on the part of individuals. This is where we come directly to the program that is involved here. Vocational education has been around for a long time. But we are now truly face-to-face with the necessity of educating and developing skills on the part of all of our people or else we are going to suffer the consequences and we have developed a kind of civilization that make those consequences become more serious day by day. We have developed a world that has no place for the uneducated and unskilled. For many years in education we were able to get by reasonably well with the assumption that only 40% of our students or 60% of our students did graduate from high school and we were able to absorb, our economy was able to absorb, that group that did not go on and finish high school.

There has been a tendency for many of us in education to refer to education on the one hand and vocational skilled training on the other without seeing that these two were intertwined and meshed so that they cannot and should not be separated. We have young people going on through our schools who do not have the information upon which to make intelligent decisions. We have also had the academic emphasis that a school system must set in motion those things that will eliminate this separateness in terms of education. With the assumption that every individual either goes the college route or he goes the other route and never the twain shall meet because it is not that clearly defined and accepted.

Coming specifically to a few things in Atlanta, let me outline briefly what our goals are and some of the things we are attempting to accomplish. Some of them are underway. We believe that our pattern is a sound one. There has been more hesitation on the local level in actually moving forward and supplementing sources. This has meant that in too many instances there has not been a realistic effort made to think through what are the needs of our community, what are the needs of the students in our schools, and how can we marshal the resources which are needed. The reverse too often has been true. Here is the money we get from the state, here is the number of teachers we can be allotted by the state vocational program, and then it would be necessary to cut our program to fit it. In Atlanta we are moving toward comprehensive high schools, eliminating the idea that we have separate vocational schools to take care of this total job. It is not an "either-or" proposition. We are probably going to have both. But we have not moved very far as yet in the development of comprehensive high schools in the sense that a student in a given high school would be able to choose many paths or several paths by which he would accomplish his goal. We will make careful delineation or decisions as to which vocational courses we offer in each high school. We are certainly making a difference in the number of vocational courses that are offered in high school in relation to the number of students who go to college. We have some schools that send 95% of their students to college and we have some that go all the way on down to 15% or 20%, so we are certainly making a difference in terms of the vocational courses that are offered. We have under construction an extensive area vocational technical school, that will offer training courses in 42 occupational areas, 42 broad areas with many divisions under each of these broad areas. This is a sizable school, it will be primarily post high school and adults, but we are making our plans so that we can say to our total community, regardless of what their needs may be: "we are going to have something in this school which will fit your needs." Now if we don't watch it, and if vocational education doesn't watch it, we are going to be moving in the area of these technical courses again to the exclusion of those courses and opportunities which are designated to meet those that cannot possibly pursue the higher level technical courses.

We have room for a big debate in the relationship between area schools and junior colleges. I won't get into that other than to say that it has not been resolved. Georgia is moving in both directions but basically in your relationship in terms of your advisory committees either on the state level but particularly on the local level vocational education, like general education, is a delegated responsibility that must be assumed by the local community. In the final analysis, the local community must answer in terms of the adequacy of the program and the local community should design, on the basis of priority, those areas of direction and those programs that will help meet the needs of a given community. This is no easy assignment and it can use the creativity and the enthusiasm and interest of all of you in terms of your knowledge of the community and the world of work and how education can best meet it. And in conclusion, certainly it should be considered in terms of an overall review of educational needs and not a separate narrow one in terms of vocational education separate from the other.

George A. Parkinson, Director, Vocational, Technical & Adult Schools,
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

In the first place we have geared our educational system in the United States to take care of 20% of our people instead of 80% of our young people. We spend 80% of our educational money in the United States to educate 20% of our young people and 20% of our money to educate 80% of our people. Second, teachers are the life blood of any educational program. It is the teachers in the classroom that do things to pupils that make things happen inside of them. This is the dynamics of your education. The first thing your teacher has got to know how to do is be a skilled worker before he can teach to his student. This means two things: you can take the graduates of your teacher education schools and try to teach him enough to train skilled workers, or you can take skilled workers and make teachers out of them. I would like to advise you on the basis of my experience that you had better take skilled workers and make teachers out of them because you can't do it the other way. The third thing, vocational and technical education is not cheap. You have got to have the best possible instruction, you have got to have the same kind of equipment they are going to use when they get out on the job and it costs money and you are going to have to prove to the state and the federal government and your city that this community will get back 10 or 20 fold as much money as it spends in the increased earning power of the people it educates. And this you can do if you put yourself to it. You can prove that they get from $10 to $15 more in returned earning power for every dollar you spend on a vocational school if it is run right.

Fourth--Vocational education like any educational program has to have its own program dynamics. Education must change individualists and must change the society which it serves and so it is true of vocational education. You can't just talk about things, you have to change the people inside and in turn they have to change the society in which they are a part or you are a failure and there is no alternative; This represents a dichotomy and a dilemma.

When change is going as rapidly as change is going today you have to have this man or woman trained for the job he is going to get as soon as he gets out of school and further for the job in 30 years from now. Our educators and educational systems are sociologically conservative. They draw their tradition from the past, they have their roots in the past and the teacher is continually living in this atmosphere of tradition and what has gone before and trying to train young people to live 30 years from now in the future. This represents a greater strain on the emotional and professional and intellectual capacity of your teachers than has ever been put on any group of educators at any time before in the history of our civilization. This is just part of the problem.

Now let me tell you two or three of the things we are doing in the Milwaukee Vocational, Technical and Adult Education Schools. We have 5 schools in this complex. A school is a group of students. The first one is the dropouts in the high school -- 16 to 18 years old. We also have an apprentice school in which we teach related instruction. We have an adult high school for people over the compulsory age limit -- mostly between the ages of 25 and 45 who have not had the opportunity for a regular high school education. We have about 800 of them there, all purely voluntary. Then we have an adult school, which is a school involving about 13,000 students who are taking courses to upgrade or retain themselves in business or industry, in ways of making a living in industry or the useful arts. Then we have an institute of technology which is fully accredited at the junior college level with about 37,000 regularly enrolled students in regularly organized courses. And we had about 25,000 students in short courses or institutes so this gives you some idea of the dimension which I am talking about. Dropouts are young people who have dropped out of the educational system and said they want to get a job. They have a high hostility index. They are hostile even to people who try to help them.

They have a low self-evaluation index, they don't think much of themselves as people, they think they are trash. They come from homes where there are emotional tensions. It may be a broken home or not but there is trouble there. There isn't the emotional security. And here is what they want. A job, a car and a girl. Only they want them in reverse order.

First we have to evaluate them. This we call our diagnostic quarter, it takes 11 weeks. They are analyzed psychologically; they take their tests; they are put in various shops and various situations; they are kept in small groups; we have the team teaching approach. At the end of 11 weeks the school is out for three weeks and the parents, the pupils, and part of the team that had this kid, sit down and discuss the matter and decide what this youngster is going to do for the rest of the time he is with us until he is 18 years old--and that is where he stays. There are two ways he can get out of this thing. He stays in that track unless he can prove to us that he can improve himself by going into a different one. Or if he shows he is really trying, if he shows dependability, if he works at it, he can be transferred to the adult school and be treated like an adult there. The kids call it crossing the bridge and some of them make it every semester. Not too many, but enough to know that the opportunity is there and if they put out the horsepower they can make it. They get out when they are 18. Increasingly, each year more and more come back, they enter the adult high school and get a diploma or enter the adult school in one of our training programs and they get a job and become what I call socially self-propelled.

Incidently, we do use the Vocational Education Act of 1963. We are doing about 35% of the manpower retraining stuff done in Wisconsin and last week you folks approved under MDTA a program for retraining about 1,800 disadvantaged youths in the coming year for $1,300,000. We do use the Economic Opportunity Program and the Aid to Education Act of the federal government. We are using every device we can to help us do the job we have to do anyway. We have not assumed a single responsibility that we didn't have before these acts were passed. They are being operated over and above the normal operations of the school. The budget for this coming year will be about $8,200,000 for this one school. Our school people tell me that they can identify these potential school dropouts a long way ahead. I have had a feeling that we should begin to type-out students at a fairly early age, not in terms of an iron-clad framework they can't get out of but in terms of the areas where they stand a reasonable chance of success as they go along. And I think our guidance people must be oriented to help them in that direction.

* * *

A question and answer period followed in which the following topics were discussed:

(a) the question of a compulsory school leaving age of 18;

(b) provision of the flexibility to permit a person to follow a number of different occupations in one lifetime;

(c) how do we take advantage of the massive legislative programs to rebuild the American educational enterprise; and

(d) what are we doing to train part-time teachers in vocational education.

* * *

Discussion on "Functions of Area Vocational Schools"

Consultant: Michael Russo

Thursday, September 9, 1965

Presentation

A pooling of resources to develop a broad program which many school districts could not afford themselves. Five occupational fields must be covered. Occupational fields must be definite, they may not be off-shoots of a single field. One-third of the appropriation must be used for part (2) and (5) of the Act. Part (2) is disadvantaged people, part (5) is construction. In planning the schools, the state should look at what industry such programs could attract, what individual needs could be met, what would be done to gain more flexibility in meeting those needs. The state makes the determiniation of what is to be offered and where choice of occupational fields to be covered must be supported by facts.

Under the area concept we can give classes which offer the students a single skill as well as a trade. The area programs will be set up in high schools, junior colleges, community colleges, or separate units but the program must not lead to a B.A. or B.S. degree. Commercial fields can be considered as occupational fields.

Present Programs

Night programs are used much more than day programs. The geographic area encompassed by an area school varies widely. Some schools are using outdated equipment. It is now possible to purchase new equipment. $55 million has been spent since the appropriation in April. 123 schools were underway as of August 16.

Question & Answer Period

Decision to set up separate facilities as against using a high school depends upon make-up of community, type of area, size of school -- main thing is to make a decision.

In looking at a comprehensive school of 14 years one must be careful that it doesn't become a mass production school that would not include the individual attention that is important to vocational-tech. training.

Don't emphasize 13-14 years as terminal but encourage students to return after 12 years for additional work whether it is at night, while working or to return on a full-time basis.

Must recruit more teachers, will need to use the resources of those in the crafts.

Some main points that were brought up were:

1. There is an overemphasis on the part of vocational counselors or teachers in high school which leads the student to believe that one or two courses will make him a journeyman.

2. Status of vocational education is low.

3. Guidance counselors are not well-trained for vocational counseling.

These conclusions were reached:

There should be better coordination among state and local programs so that successful techniques could be transplanted to other areas and labor bodies and educators must work together to set standards on vocational classes.

* * *

Discussion on "New Ways of Training for Industry"

Consultant: Edwin L. Rumpf

Thursday, September 9, 1965

Presentation

Under the broadest definition of Industry we include all that is traditionally seen as integral and the broad spectrum of agriculture as well. Against this background Mr. Rumpf set out to talk about (1) new provisions in old laws, (2) new laws, and (3) new institutional techniques resulting from these changes. He pointed up the relationship between training for industry and the needs of industry, stressing the need to do something about it. The traditional institutional programs have been occupation oriented. The new programs are designed to be clientele oriented. In this connection Mr. Rumpf stressed the NDEA 1958 facilities can be used in conjunction with the 1963 Act, and that the overall program ties into civil rights, adult education, and all social action legislation.

The structure in these programs, Rumpf pointed out, is Federal - State - Local, in that order. The State Boards have a very real responsibility in allocating funds for various programs and locations. They are charged with insuring (1) universal availability, (2) support for basic education, and (3) contracting for Vocational Education services (any kind of vocational education opportunities needed by an individual may be provided for him even from a profit making organization). Of course, there are some instances in which State laws may alter these responsibilities. Therefore, the discussion is in reference here to the Federal Laws.

Discussion

The discussion centered on a number of main points using the presentation as a point of departure. A summary of these points follows:

(1) It is easily forseeable that a union could set up a training school with Federal funds. In such a program, however, participation would have to be open to all who wished to participate, since public funds would be spent. But, a union may be contracted to provide the training. In this context, even a small businessman could start an OJT program turning the trainees into his regular help upon completion. The point to bear in mind is that although many people think Vocational Education is only in school rooms, there is no reason why cooperative placing in industry cannot occur. Such training can conceivably apply even to pre-apprenticeship training.

(2) Trades and Industry are only one of many relationships in Vocational Education. Labor reaction in such a discussion is often confined to the area of apprenticeship. However, the advisory council has a greater responsibility than to the member's unions. The activities of the council proliferate all of Vocational Education. It means members broadening their approach to the general issues. Cooperative training, in-plant training, upgrading, and updating in service can all be done.

(3) The problem of developing guidelines in specific terms is a big one. The local people and the State Directors are key people in this process. It must be done within the framework of the State Plan. In Washington we have guidelines developed with the people in the field. These people must assist and advise on the great amount of development yet to be done in establishing flexible programs. In a sense it has to come from the bottom up.

* * *

Discussion on the "Disadvantaged Youth"

Consultant: Barbara Kemp

Thursday, September 9, 1965

Presentation

The presentation by Miss Kemp was based on the four page leaflet which introduced the purpose of the conference. This leaflet summarized the characteristics of the youths and adults to be discussed by the conference members. Miss Kemp went over the provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 which relate to the purpose of the conference and she stated that Congress, in this Act, was putting special emphasis on the "socioeconomically disadvantaged." She mentioned four programs for which federal money is available: 1) research and pilot programs; 2) programs which provide part-time work for those youth who would not be able to continue their education for financial reasons; 3) residential centers for "drop-outs;" and 4) some programs working with trainable mentally and physically handicapped persons -- though the main concern are those who are socially and educationally handicapped. Miss Kemp also brought out the fact that these programs were not designed for delinquents or those of particularly low I.Q. but rather for those youth and adults within a normal I.Q. range and especially for those in urban and rural areas where employment has declined and persons are not getting proper training for employment elsewhere.

Miss Kemp also emphasized the fact that previous action by school superintendents and heads of vocational education curriculum has been limited and discouraging because of a lack of funds. Now these persons can get money for vocational education from various federal sources and they should take advantage of all of these, especially those provided for in the General Education Act. These outside sources of money can be used to obtain ancillary services like health clinics and guidance counsellors as well as programs to train teachers to better handle and understand the needs and problems of the disadvantaged youth.

This presentation was ended by Miss Kemp mentioning that there are 20,000 titles in the Dictionary of Occupations and that new occupations in the human service areas are opening up daily. Also Miss Kemp emphasized that parents must be brought in on the career training of the youth and that they must be persuaded to encourage their children to stay in school and obtain the needed education. In closing she added that the total community must be involved in this problem and that every state should have a person to handle the problems of the "socioeconomically handicapped."

Discussion

1) Are there funds available for training teachers to work with these disadvantaged groups? Yes. The General Education Act provides funds for this purpose.

2) If one measures the I.Q.'s, etc. of this group, they would be skewed to the left because by the time this group were tested the various individuals would have already fallen short of their potential I.Q. It is near impossible to measure individual's original potential. Some of the Federal programs, such as the Job Corps, have had some success in bringing out these potential talents; but generally it is difficult to even determine what these potentialities are.

3) The money provided for in the General Education Act for the disadvantaged youth are not principally for urban areas but are designed to help families in low income groups no matter where they are located. Of course it will be easier to incorporate these programs in urban centers, but a number of rural communities can get together and take advantage of the funds.

4) Where employment opportunities of one state are limited, it may be necessary for one state to train people for employment in another state.

In order to have any form of this vocational education program work, there must be mobility and a general, high level of economic activity.

5) There may be a problem of leaning too heavily on the apprenticeship program in the building trades. If too many people are taken into the various apprenticeship programs, the market may become flooded; thus creating an unfair situation for all those in the program.

6) There exists a definite difference between the qualifications for participation in the Poverty Programs and the various other Federal programs. In this discussion we are talking about programs in vocational high schools and Technical Junior Colleges; not the MTDA programs which work with the youth who have dropped out of school.

7) Certain problems have been created between the various programs such as the Youth Corp and Vocational Education Act program because the amount of money the student is allowed to earn is quite different.

8) Many problems exist in the present vocational school programs. Among these are antiquated machines and equipment, improperly trained teachers, and not enough guidance personnel. The result is that the graduates of these schools are not really prepared for even the apprenticeship programs. In New Haven, Connecticut persons have tried to alleviate this problem to some extent by setting up a pre-apprenticeship program with tradesmen in charge of the group. In some cases MTDA money has been used to set up these pre-apprenticeship programs. Without some such program, the disadvantaged youth will either be excluded from the apprenticeship programs or labor standard will not be able to be maintained. Union tradesmen can work with employers to make sure that employment will be available. There also needs to be better cooperation and communication between the Federal vocational education programs and the building trades unions. In many cases Federal representatives go directly to employers rather than working through the unions. The result is often a lowering of labor standards.

9) Another problem is that very few high school graduates from disadvantaged backgrounds apply for the buildings trades unions' apprenticeship programs because they prefer to go into white collar jobs. The fact of the matter is that very few of these youths could even qualify for the regular apprenticeship programs.

10) Many people felt that the building trade unions' apprenticeship programs are the panacea to all problems concerning the training of the disadvantaged youth. Actually, employment in the building trades accounts for only about 3% of the total employment opportunities. The main goal of any program should be to encourage the youth to finish high school.

11) The main question which should be discussed at a conference of this type is what can the labor movement generally, and the building trades union in particular, do to take advantage of the programs provided in the various federal acts in working with the disadvantaged youth.

a) Union people should not just talk about the programs in line with selfish motives or they are likely to be left out.

b) The Operating Engineers in West Virginia started one quite successful program which then lead into the state setting up a state commission to continue and expand the program.

c) Union representatives on committees to advise in vocational education should be given a better and broader background. Often what happens now is that the union representative speaks up only when his particular union is affected and therefore he does not represent the labor movement in the community.

d) Perhaps unions should reevaluate the qualifications necessary for a youth to take advantage of the apprenticeship programs. This would not mean a lowering of the standards but rather making sure that all of the requirements for admission are actually necessary for success in that particular trade.

* * *

Discussion on "The 'State Plan' From A to Z"

Discussion Leader: Otto Pragan

Thursday, September 9, 1965

Presentation

The members of this group are to assume themselves to be members of an advisory council whose job it is to set up a State Plan for Vocational Education. The sources which are to be used are Milestones in Education, a bulletin supplied by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the California Plan, and Project Programs for New York. In Milestones in Education, one finds a breakdown of the amounts supplied by the George-Barden and Supplemental Acts and the Smith-Hughes Act for each activity, by state, for the fiscal year 1965. In the California State Plan, it is explained how a state might apply for these federal monies; and in the Project Programs Report for New York, an outline of the various state programs is given.

In setting up a state plan two main considerations must be foremost in the minds of an advisory committee of this nature. First, the program must be balanced; and second, it must reflect the present and future labor market and economic conditions of the state as much as possible. Included in a well-balanced program would be projects for the high-school aged youth, the post-high school aged youth, adults, and specially handicapped individuals as well as other groups which reflect problems peculiar to a certain region or state. The state is asked to outline what is being done in the state at present and how it would use any new funds.

The Washington office will then evaluate the program from each state periodically to determine how well the projected state plan is being carried out.

One important aspect of these programs is the ratio of matching funds provided by the individual states to carry out their programs. Under the George-Barden Act and the Smith-Hughes Act the ratio of state funds to federal funds was about 4:1; whereas under the Education Act for 1965 the ratio has been closer to 3:1. It is vitally important that as the amount of money spent by the federal government on education increases the amount spent by state and local governments increase at the same rate. From observation, it appears that where the state agency is in charge of the program and where the particular act is permanent, there has been no problem getting matching state funds; but in programs like MTDA where the federal agency has the final say, matching funds are hard to come by.

A final matter which must be kept in mind by any advisory council of this type is that any and all state plans must comply with the Civil Rights Acts. This element will be used by the Washington office when it evaluates the various projects contained in a state plan.

Outline

Objective: To develop programs which meet both the manpower needs of the state and the needs of the individual.

Sequence of events in setting up a State Plan:

1) Passage of the statute.

2) Familiarization with the regulations of the statute.

3) Develop a State Plan:

    a) Establish present and future "needs" of the state including the needs of the society, community, and individual - this will probably be the weakest area because data is not available;

    b) Outline the various public and private programs which are in existence and evaluate each one in context with the established "needs";

    c) Propose new programs in areas where coverage is insufficient.

4) Determine the cost of the programs and where the money will come from:

    a) Federal funds;

    b) Matching state funds;

    c) Extra state and local funds.

5) Where the cost of the program exceeds the financial resources available, list the various projects in terms of priority. This should be done by the advisory board and the director of the programs. Members of such an advisory committee should keep in mind that the list should again reflect the present and future "needs" of the state and that they represent not single organizations but a large number of organizations and individuals.

Thursday, September 9, 1965 (Dinner Meeting)

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Address: Dr. Ralph C. Wenrich, Professor, School of Education, University of
Michigan

The topic on which I am to speak divides itself into two parts: (1) vocational education and (2) leadership. My thesis is simply that the organization and operation of sound vocational education programs--on the local, state and national levels--depends upon qualified leadership.

But what is sound vocational education? And what do we mean by qualified leadership?

The term vocational education has many different connotations, and some of them are very restricted. For example, vocational education to some people is limited to programs supported by the Federal vocational education acts. Because of the restricted connotations attached to the term, I will use the phrase, "education for work," which has not yet acquired an assortment of special meanings.

The first point I would like to make is that changes in our society have placed upon the public schools a major responsibility for education for work.

With advancing industrialization the emphasis in the economy shifted from primary industry--that is, agriculture, lumbering and fishing--to secondary industry--building and manufacturing. In primary industry the work was relatively unskilled, whereas in secondary industry much of the work is skilled and semi-skilled, and some is white-collar in the form of office workers in the factory. Then too, primary industry, especially farming, was closely related with the home, while secondary industry is generally separated from the home. This shift in the occupational structure placed upon education a major role in preparing men for work.

The educational threshold of employment has been steadily raised since the Industrial Revolution, and especially, during the last half century. Labor on the farm did not demand literacy, but skilled jobs in the factory (including clerical work) required literacy and more. With automation taking over many of the routine tasks, a larger proportion of jobs increasingly fall into the upper ranges of skilled and technical know-how. Highly trained men are the most crucial economic resource in a technological society. These men must be educated in our schools and colleges to perform the work of our society.

My second point is that education for work, as a responsibility of the public schools, has been accepted in theory, but educational practice has lagged far behind.

Many reasons might be given for the discrepancy between stated educational policy and actual practice; to consider a few might be useful.

1. Our secondary schools have been, and still are, staffed with subject-matter specialists primarily interested in the preparation of youth for college; such faculties want to maintain the "prep school" idea.

2. Education for work, especially specialized vocational and technical education, is more expensive. Many school districts have had trouble financing even a minimum program.

3. Effective programs leading directly to employment are more difficult to operate than academic programs, because they require a close working relationship with many community groups including both labor and management.

4. The more vocal segment of the public has not, until recently, demanded that the schools give the needs of employment-bound youth at least as much attention as has been given college-bound youth. The sons and daughters of school board members and other policy-making persons in the community are, for the most part, college-bound, and the educational offerings serve their needs quite well.

5. In the past many programs of education for employment were not functional; that is, they were not geared to the needs and interests of students and to the employment opportunities available to youth.

My third point is that the time has come, if it is not long overdue, when our programs and practices must catch up with our stated policy; the general public is now demanding that all youth be given (in addition to a good general education) the opportunity to discover and develop their special talents.

The fourth point I want to make is that if education for work is to meet the expectations of the people to be served, the task of the vocational educator must be perceived more broadly. We must come to see education for work as the process of discovering and developing human potential for work. Public education in a democratic society is dominated by the idea or the ideal that all children and youth be provided with equal educational opportunities so that each individual might develop his potential as far as possible. All too frequently the phrase "equal educational opportunity" is taken to mean the same opportunities for all. But children and youth, like adults, are unique; no single curriculum nor any particular set of learning experiences can be expected to discover and develop the talents of all.

Education for work can also be described in terms of educational objectives which, when achieved, produce a successful worker. Such objectives fall into three categories: (1) the cognitive, which includes those objectives which deal with the recall or recognition of knowledge, and the development of intellectual abilities and skills; (2) the affective, which includes those objectives which are concerned with changes in interests, attitudes, and values, and the development of appreciations; (3) the psychomotor, which includes the manipulative or motor skills and which require neuro-muscular coordination. Each of these three classifications cannot be considered separate from the other two, because the human being must be considered as a total organism, or a "whole" being. Thinking, feeling and acting are combined in the behavior of humans.

Traditionally, the emphasis in education has been on the cognitive objectives. One exception to this is in the field of vocational education where the emphasis has been on manipulative skills. But education for work involves all three areas, and therefore, it is not simply a matter of providing for some learners the manual skills needed to get and hold a job. The effective worker must be able to manipulate facts and ideas as well as materials and things; his interests, attitudes, appreciations and values are also important to his success as a worker. Changes in the occupational structure suggest the need for a shift in emphasis in programs of education for work in which more attention must be given to the cognitive and affective kinds of learnings.

Education for work can be thought of as producer education, as distinguished from consumer education. The educated person is willing and able to carry his share of the load by producing goods or services for which society has a need. Some of this productivity can be achieved through his vocation; much of it can be achieved through the work which he does outside the job. This conference is particularly concerned with education for work in one's vocation. However, with the decrease in the number of hours per week which man is required to work on the job, he will need more work (or play) to engage him during his "leisure time." To this extent, the task of education for work outside the job will become increasingly important and should be recognized by educators and laymen responsible for educational policy-making.

Education for work must include both general and specialized education. While it is imperative that we avoid a dichotomy between the two, it is equally important that we understand the distinctive purpose of each, and the relationship of both to education for work. Although general education seeks to discover and develop individual talent, it emphasizes preparation for activities in which men engage in common as citizens, workers, family members and members of other groups in the community.

Vocational education is specialized education aimed at the development of competence required in a particular occupation or family of occupations. It can be provided for youth not yet employed, as preparation for employment, or for employed workers to supplement the competencies they already possess for purposes of upgrading or retraining. Vocational education, in order to be meaningful, should be provided in a setting where the relations and applications to the actual work of a particular occupation or family of occupations can be taught. It should be so timed that the instruction is provided when the learner needs it and will apply it to useful and productive work. Vocational education involves the teaching of both the skills and knowledges and attitudes essential to successful performance in a particular occupation or family of occupations.

Technical education is simply a term used to designate a particular kind of specialized vocational education. Technical education is designed to prepare youth and adults for employment in occupations which frequently (although not always) require considerable knowledge of science and mathematics as applied to a particular occupation. Technical education, or the preparation of "technicians," frequently occurs on the post-high school or community college level.

It seems to me that education for work must include (1) those general education experiences which all future workers need regardless of the occupation they will enter, and (2) those specialized education experiences needed by youth and adults to establish and maintain themselves in the world of work. If we are genuinely concerned about the full development of our human resources, we cannot neglect either general or specialized education.

Frequently, general education and vocational education are put in an antithetical relationship. Too long the idea has prevailed in our tradition that a general or liberal education is one thing, and a vocational or professional education is another. The two are not in conflict, but should complement and enhance one another. Education is, or should be, a unified process developing in the student the qualities of mind, the values and attitudes, and the skills required of him to build a life full of meaning and productivity. Make a life and make a living, for most individuals, are intertwined; so should education for living and working be unified.

Education for work is an investment in people; it should include all kinds of experiences which will result in the discovery and development of human resources, especially the potential for work. In economic terms, human resource development is an investment in human beings and in a strong economy.

Education for work is a continuing process. Since the average person will change his job at least three times during his working career, the schools cannot possibly educate youth for a lifetime of employment. They can and must help each student make the transition from school to initial employment. Continuing educational opportunities must be provided by either the schools or the employing establishment, or both, if the worker is to maintain employment stability.

Education for work has been discussed in relation to the purposes of education and as an investment in people, but it can also be examined in terms of outcome. A comprehensive program of education for work, beginning in the elementary school and extending through the secondary school, the community college, and the part-time adult school, will hopefully achieve the following outcomes:

1. Children and youth would acquire a knowledge of the materials of our culture and would develop the ability to use them effectively.

2. Children and youth would develop an understanding of the world of work and gain insight as to how they can relate to it.

3. They would acquire an understanding of the meaning of work in their lives and develop a wholesome attitude toward work.

4. They would develop a respect for the dignity of work and appreciate the value of work to society.

5. They would experience and learn to appreciate good workmanship.

6. They would develop good habits of work.

7. They would discover and develop their special aptitudes and talents and relate them to productive activity.

8. Youth would have tentative career plans based upon their understanding of the world of work and their own strengths and weaknesses.

9. Youth would acquire specialized vocational education preparing them for an entry occupation prior to terminating their full-time formal education.

10. Youth would have developed their capacity for continued learning so that they might be able to maintain and improve their efficiency as workers.

11. Adults would avail themselves of opportunities for additional education and training so as to maintain employment stability.

The concepts which I have expressed about education for work (including vocational education) are of little value unless and until they are translated into programs and services for children, youth and adults. This is the function of leadership in educational administration. One cannot deny the fact that a quality program of education for work requires good teachers, up-to-date facilities, and adequate financial support so that you can have these and other essential ingredients. But my experience leads me to believe that the most critical factor in the development and operation of sound vocational education programs is the quality of the leadership provided. Because I believe this so strongly, I have spent some of my time and energies during the past several years on the problem of leadership development.

We started out by asking ourselves the question, "What is leadership, and how do you recognize it?" The literature was more helpful in telling us what leadership is not than it was in telling us what it is. There is, however, agreement among people who have studied leadership that you cannot distinguish leaders from non-leaders on the basis of traits or personality characteristics. That is, a person might be trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean and reverent, and still not be a leader.

The Michigan State Board of Control for Vocational Education, on the recommendation of Mr. Robert Winger, State Director of Vocational Education, funded an experimental project which has become known as the Michigan Leadership Development Project for Vocational and Technical Education. The primary purpose of this project was to identify, select, recruit and develop persons for leadership roles in local and intermediate school districts in Michigan. A secondary purpose was to find out how one can identify potential leadership and to learn more about what constitutes a sound program for the development of leadership in vocational and technical education.

In the past, persons have moved into leadership positions in vocational-technical education with little or no special preparation for such roles. The common pattern of educational preparation of vocational personnel in our public schools is one of early specialization. Most teachers are recruited into the profession on the basis of their interests and technical competence in a particular trade or other occupation, and with a minimum amount of professional preparation and general education. Among teachers so recruited are many very able individuals who may rise to leadership positions, but frequently without the opportunity to acquire an understanding of the nature of our society and its needs. They need help in gaining an understanding of the total educational enterprise and of social and economic conditions of our society. They also need to develop the skills and abilities of an effective leader.

In my opinion effective leadership in vocational and technical education can be characterized as follows:

1. The effective vocational education leader helps others to accept common goals. The leader must himself be enthusiastic about what he is doing and bring other members of the group to accept "the cause." If, for example, he is working in a comprehensive high school where the majority of the faculty have as their dominant goal, the preparation of youth for college, the vocational education leader must help them to reexamine this goal in the light of the needs of the youth in that school and the conditions of our society with the hope that, in due time, he will help them to accept new goals.

2. The effective vocational education leader initiates productive action in group situations. He realizes that he is effective to the extent that he can influence the behavior of others. But perhaps more important, he initiates the action. That is, he provides an atmosphere or a set of conditions in which things will happen. He motivates the group to act and then makes available to them the resources necessary to get things done.

3. The effective vocational education leader establishes clear plans and work procedures. Once a goal has been accepted and it has been decided to take action, the leader must chart the course and set up the ground rules.

4. The effective vocational education leader maintains warm relationships between himself and group members. While the leader must be goal-oriented, he must also be people-oriented. He can hope to accomplish the goals only through the active and constructive involvement of the members of the group.

5. The effective vocational education leader obtains commitment and cooperation from those with whom he works. He does this through persuasion rather than through threat or force, such as the authority of his official position.

6. The effective vocational education leader effects change and builds organizations for the achievement of meaningful purposes. He is basically an innovator and should be a student of how change is achieved. He must be careful, however, not to encourage change solely for the sake of change.

Vocational and technical education in the Unites States must take new directions, if it is to serve youth and adults and our society. To determine the proper goals, to initiate the necessary action, to establish clear plans and procedures and then to help the groups work cooperatively toward the achievement of these goals is the challenge for the leader in vocational and technical education. He can be expected to succeed only if he knows how to work with people; both within his own group and with people in other groups whose cooperation is essential.

Friday, September 10, 1965 (Morning Session)

Chairman: Walter Arnold, Director, Division of Vocational & Technical Education, U.S. Office of Education

Panel Members: Edwin C. Brown, Secretary-Treasurer, Rhode Island AFL-CIO

Byrl Shoemaker, Director, Vocational Education, State of Ohio

Otto Pragan, Assistant Director, Dept. of Education, AFL-CIO

THE JOB OF THE LABOR REPRESENTATIVE

Chairman: Walter Arnold, Director, Division of Vocational & Technical Education, U.S. Office of Education

First I would like to refer you to section 5a of the Vocational Act of 1963 which deals with the designation of the state board as the sole agency for the administration of the state plan or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies. Now here is the key sentence. "And if such state board does not include as members persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor in the state and persons representative of junior colleges, technical institutes or other institutions of higher education which provide programs of technical and vocational training meeting the definition, the Vocational Education Act provides for the designation or creation of a state advisory council which shall include such persons to consult with the state board in carrying out the state plan."

The second reference in the regulations is 104.3 sub (a) and (b). Sub (a) stems out of the original Smith-Hughes and George Barden acts. Very briefly I will give it to you. "As a condition for the receipt of its allotment of federal funds the acts require the state through its legislative authority to designate or create a state board of not less than three members having all necessary power to cooperate with the Office of Education in the administration of the state plan. The state plan shall identify the state board so designated and created. In administering the Vocational Education Act program for which allotments are made to the state under the acts, the Office of Education will deal only through the state board and its authorized representatives except as other wise provided for in the state plan." Sub part (b) deals with the composition of the state board or state advisory council. It really repeats what the law says but it adds another broadening statement. The state plan provides that either the state board or state advisory council created or designed by the state board to consult with the state board in carrying out the state plan include as members; (1) persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor in the state. The state plan shall describe the criteria to be followed in determining whether such persons meet such qualifications. With respect to persons familiar with the vocational needs of management and labor in the state such criteria shall indicate that such familiarity will have been acquired directly through recent actual work in or through association with the fields of management or labor in the state. The language of the law is such that it is rather difficult to got legal counsel to define this in much more direct terms than that. Unless you can commit yourself to some reasonably thorough understanding of the law and the regulations and what constitutes the great variety of things in vocational education, I think you will be terribly handicapped either as a board member or as an advisory member on a council.

Otto Pragan, Assistant Director, Department of Education, AFL-CIO

I want to make only two or three points and one of the points is: What is the role of the state board of the state advisory council? It is true that the role of the state board of vocational education is as old as vocational education is in this country, namely, as old as Smith-Hughes. I want only to say in the same section which has been quoted it says also that the state board is the sole agency for the administration of the state plan. Later on it is clearly stated if we don't have a state board of the composition as the law prescribes then a state must set up a state advisory council. I say that the state advisory council is also responsible for the administration of the state plan. I think that it is terribly important that we are of the opinion or we believe that the work of the state advisory council is of an advisory nature to the administration of the state plan. If this is not the point then I think we are on the way to become rubber stamps. Nobody wants to be a rubber stamp. Walter has pointed out that persons familiar with vocational needs of management and labor are those people who are to serve on this board. We have fought this language in the law. I want to be very honest with you, we lost this fight. In our testimony on April 24, 1963 we told the subcommittee that we believed that section 3 (a) would endanger the role of advisory councils in the state because of the narrow language of persons familiar with the vocational education needs and objectives of management and labor. We asked particularly that the language be more specific. But we asked for more. We asked also that the proposed legislation spell out very clearly the responsibilities of the advisory council; this is not really done in the law. We said that among these responsibilities should be such things as a review of changes in the labor market, job skills, training needs, the quality of the vocational program and instruction. I am unhappy to report that we lost this fight.

After this bill became law, the regulations were written and during this process a committee of the AFL-CIO met with Brother Arnold and his friends. One of the points we had arguments about was the legal interpretation of our familiar word labor and management. Now if, for instance, we have a man on a state advisory council who 36 years ago was a member of the carpenter union and meanwhile became president of several corporations, is he really directly, through recent actual experience and work, associated with labor in his state? This is a very serious problem because there is no doubt that the state federation AFL-CIO is a representation of institutional, organized labor in the state. You don't have to like labor but there is no doubt it is the organization, like the Chamber of Commerce is the institution of business administration and, therefore, it is this organization that is best equipped to represent labor on such a committee and, to be more specific, to nominate a candidate for such a position to the governor of a state.

The states have moved very slowly on the creation of state advisory councils. Today, after 2 years, we still have 3 states where no advisory councils at all have been appointed or states where the state boards of vocational education do not have labor representatives on the board. We have 4 states that have labor members familiar with labor and management but people whom we can never recognize as speaking on behalf of labor.

We believe that it is the responsibility of the Commissioner of Education to carry out all conditions under which federal grants should be given to the states. It is very interesting that section 5 (a) is written in such a way that it says a state which desires to receive federal funds should submit a state plan in such details as a commissioner deems necessary. Detail no. 1 is the designation of a state board. I think the time has come where the commissioner will have to look at this no. 1 and will have to tell these states to appoint advisory councils and to put on these committees and councils such people as are in compliance with the regulations.

The next point I want to make: it is the people who work on the councils who can make the councils work. The objective difficulties for effective service of the labor representative of such councils is that the state federations of the AFL-CIO are under-financed, are under-staffed, therefore, the identical person so very often has to serve on a lot of committees. As a result he cannot do his homework properly. He becomes a rubber stamp or somebody in a position without having his arguments always in the right order. This is an objective difficulty. How you overcome the difficulties is very difficult to determine. It is something which will vary from state to state. It is very easy to say that each state organization should have a staff research director or education director who would give the representative all the information he needs. But this would be an awfully righteous proposition because the state federation very often just doesn't have the financial means to hire staff. If we have full time staff people who are capable of doing the necessary leg work, they should be made available for this kind of work. Somehow we must learn to delegate the various representative positions. It is not possible for the state person to serve really efficiently on all committees. When I say delegate, it is not necessary to have a person who is an officer of the state federation. It can be some person who has the ability and is on the staff of an international union which is headquartered in the state or an international representative or a regional director; professional staff people who are working in the particular state. The second problem, in my opinion, is to make more use of the professional staff of international unions which are headquartered in some states. I think the state federation should learn more properly to use the free services available from the staff members of internationals.

Thirdly, we have to do a little more to make available to you resources and other aids in order to help you to serve on the state advisory councils. One more point: the responsibilities of the labor member on the state advisory council. He must be interested and he must understand the whole spectrum of vocational training through the whole state, not only his own trade. He must not only be interested in the field of vocational education as such but vocational education as a part of the general education in the state and the nation. One thing we sometimes forget is to know the policies of the AFL-CIO; we do have policies and they are old policies that go back many years. The resolutions and all the information we put out should be known to the people who represent labor on these state advisory councils.

In conclusion, the question here is that the new direction cannot only mean policies or new philosophies but it must also mean new directions in the administration of vocational education. To change the state administration, to change the local administration of vocational education, takes more than two years. In trying to give new directions to the administration of these laws in carrying out the new direction of the substances of vocational education I think we have the major responsibility of the labor representative who should know these new directions and think of how to carry them out in his own state. It is only possible if the labor representative is not a rubber stamp, if he thinks alone, independently and then embody that new things have to de done, and only if he is informed can he do it. So, in my opinion, if the labor representative actually acts and behaves effectively he behaves really as a representative of all the workers in his state, not only the workers, but also progressive forces of education in his state.

Walter Arnold, Director, Division of Vocational & Technical Education, U.S. Office of Education

There are a great number of people in this country who object to the clause in the law that the state board shall be the sole agency in administering the program and in fact it was one of the major issues right inside our department. If you went back to 1917 when the Smith-Hughes Act was passed and looked at the state departments of education in this country you would find all kinds of conglomerations of "legalise" and conflicting authorities and all kinds of types of arrangements that the Congress specified. That there would be a state board designated with full authority has been the blessing of vocational education. In this state, for example, the state board consisted of 3 state university presidents and two of them never showed up, I understand, at meetings, so that left one man to make most of the decisions. In the state where I work the state superintendent was elected every two years on a party ticket and had more authority over education, except vocational education, than the board did. Title 5 of the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides 25 million dollars to strengthen the state departments of education and there is presently going on in each one of your states a very thorough survey of what the state department consists of, what its staffing is, what its weaknesses are, and what laws constitute it. So I recommend to you that you try to examine the study that is going on now and take a look at what kind of assistance is going to come to the states out of this 25 million dollars to strengthen those state departments of education because that has a direct relationship to the administration of vocational education and the job of this representative.

In the span of less than 2 years there are 47 governmental jurisdictions that have complied with the law and formed advisory councils and have, apparently, proper labor representation on them. But in our book we look upon that as quite a mark coming from zero up to what that percentage would be. The way we operate on the audit and certification of funds to states and the audit of funds, is a thing which is not finished yet. There is continuing post-audit of all of these situations. There is no assurance that any of these states will continue to get money if by post-audit they are found to be in violation of these conditions. The reports of the states are coming in right now. In these state reports they are obliged to report what they actually did with respect to this condition and many others.

Byrl Shoemaker, Director, Vocational Education, State of Ohio

There is a general advisory committee in Ohio with representation from labor on that committee. We have a general technical education advisory committee; we have a special purposes education committee. One of course which I don't have a direct responsibility for is the state apprenticeship council. We have our state youth club committee, we have an instructional materials development committee, a general committee over all structural materials in which labor is represented. We have law enforcement committees, and service training. So we have functioning advisory committees; some of them are good but some of them are not doing a job at the present time. Now let me identify some points for evaluation of committee activity. I think one of the things is you have a job of evaluating that the committee function in the way it should. Some people asked to serve on a committee don't know what it is to do. Believe me, when you meet at a national level with Paul Hutchins and Fred Irwin, your committee had better be functioning and better function right or you will be told about it. One of the things: is the purpose of the committee clear? Many times committees were not organized properly, did not function properly, have gotten disgusted and quit serving. But is the purpose of that committee clear, do you know why you are involved in that committee?

Secondly, is the appointing authority or person requesting the committee willing to listen to advice and counsel? Is the tenure of the persons invited clear? How long are you to serve? Does the leadership provide for truly democratic action? Is the advisory committee operated so as to provide ideas and suggestions which may influence the thinking of the administration? They should affect the thinking of the administration. But it should not be used as a club to try and force some group into an action. Is the committee discussion directed toward a plan for action rather than an excuse for doing nothing? Are meetings called regularly and is the purpose of each meeting clear? Do you send out an agenda ahead of time so you can do your homework in this area? Is the committee small enough to allow for full participation of all members? Is effective use made of committees or is it window dressing?

Some recommendations to you regarding the participation on state level advisory committees: if you ever want representation from organized labor, you come to organized labor and ask for it. Don't you pick a labor member and assume you have representation from organized labor. He cannot speak for that organization. We have a lot of people on state committes who do not represent organized labor. Sure they are from organized labor and they may be an effective labor person but they cannot represent that state AFL-CIO unless that AFL-CIO says they can represent them. Select your representatives on the basis of their understanding of the problems of labor and education. Secondly, interest in vocational education. Thirdly, willingness to take the necessary time. Fourth, attitudes which will enable them to take a constructive look at the problem presented. Another point is willingness to work with management, education, and lay public representatives. Another point is to maintain a continuity of membership. If at each meeting you have a different representative, he doesn't even begin to understand what the problem is. Another point: provide a means for your labor representative to communicate with your policy-making unit in the state organization. Your representative on committees should insist on an adequate briefing on a problem before being asked to react to something. State committees are much more difficult than local committees. I have worked with local committees and have found it easy to begin to work effectively on items. I have worked with our state advisory committee on vocational education on the 1963 act and I will defy you to say that our representation is not sound. But we are just now, after one years' operation, getting to the point where I am beginning to feel a committee reaction, other than absorbing. In closing: a pooling of ignorance is indefensible; a pooling of indifference is futile; an absence defeats the best of intentions and the greatest of ability.

Edwin C. Brown, Secretary-Treasurer, Rhode Island AFL-CIO

No vocational education program is going to be worth its salt unless we have the full cooperation of organized labor. These committees have failed in a great many instances. The lack of knowledge of the committee members over the functions they are to perform has been cited. I think they have come on these committees unprepared and no attempt has been made to enlighten them on what they really are supposed to do. From my experience the selection of committees is a rather important function, because if you are going to have the cooperation of organized labor, or any other segment of the community, you have got to have the organization represented and in the past there have been too many committees where governors or administrators have chosen people because of politics, or friendship, or ignorance of what is going on within a labor organization. On the state level there is no question in my mind that members of a state advisory committee ought to be recommended by the state council in that particular state. The same in the local areas. For the crafts, I think the crafts involved should make the selection of who is going to represent their craft on a particular committee. Now you are going to have several committees operating. Within the labor movement what I think we ought to do more of is the coordination of the work of these committees. I think from time to time these committees ought to meet, exchange information, make a report to the education committee of the state organization. The education committee can make this report available to the convention at a particular time, whether it is an annual convention or every two years. Unless procedures like that are followed we are going to end up with an awful lot of misunderstanding.

Very often I hear that organized labor is opposed to vocational education. Time and time again we have opposed a great many programs of vocational education. I myself, at home, have taken very vigorous stands against vocational education projects; it is the abuses of vocational education programs that bring the wrath of organized labor upon them. In a great many instances they are in direct competition with private industry. Because you don't sanction these things you are opposed to vocational education. Well if that is opposition that is what they are going to have as far as I am concerned from organized labor. But we are as much in favor of vocational education as we are of any form of education. We have had experiences in the past where employers have tried to recruit cheap labor in vocational schools, those youngsters who have had a smattering of some skills, to go into the shops over the peak periods. I think this is a very unfair thing to be doing to young students. I think they ought to get their schooling first and then go into industry. I think they ought to learn just as much as they possibly can before industry siphons them off. And, of course, there have been times where these employers looking for the fast buck have tried to use them as strike breakers from the vocational schools, just to keep the machines running. If a kid can operate a lathe machine, a milling machine or something like that they are going to get them into the shop and use them the best they can. These are the abuses where organized labor has raised the devil with vocational education programs.

We had the people from Columbia University and Lynn Emerson advising us on the program which we should follow in the state of Rhode Island. One of the recommendations they made to the board, and which we adopted, was that the advisory committee should have a set of by-laws spelling out such things as have been referred to here today. In addition to the by-laws we have an outline of what the advisory committee should be doing right along the line. I think these things are a great help to the advisory committees because, in a sense, they come in a little better prepared than otherwise. We can determine the training needs of a particular area. The vocational program may not necessarily be the same in all sections of the state. There are different areas that should have different services. I think our labor people can make a heck of a contribution to the guidance programs. I have talked to a lot of guidance people and I think of all our weaknesses the guidance program is the weakest of all. There are an awful lot of changes which the committee members could recommend either to the instructor or the board of education or the department. We have used them in Rhode Island in helping us pick the location of the schools, the recruitment of instructors, selection of equipment and training materials, counseling and the placement of the trainees, suggestions with respect to work projects they are going to undertake. Another important role they can play is to help secure adequate funds, go to the legislature, go to the governor and the educational commissioner to get adequate funds with which to conduct a program. It is things like that that I think members of advisory committees ought to be following along on.

A question and answer session followed which covered the following topics:

(a) how frequently advisory committees should meet and what sort of agenda should be prepared by whom? and

(b) what should be done in the event that advisory committee meetings are called infrequently or not at all.

Friday, September 10, 1965 (Luncheon Meeting)

MANPOWER TRAINING AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Address: Stanley Ruttenberg, Manpower Administrator, U.S. Department of Labor

There is a quote from the last manpower report of the President to the Congress in March of 1965 which I think is worth my reading to you here now. It is a quote of President Johnson in his manpower report and it is quite pertinent to the subject you have been discussing here and it says nothing matters more than education to the future of our country. Not our military preparedness, for armed might is worthless if we lack the brainpower to build a world of peace; not our productive economy, for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government, for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant; I think that sets the tone for the seriousness of the problem confronting us.

The Manpower Development and Training Act which I want to talk about in its relationship to the vocational education system was first proposed to the Congress in 1962. In the face of what was then persistent high level unemployment, in spite of an economic recovery which was quite significant in the early years of the Kennedy administration, and an economic recovery which has been maintained, persistent high level unemployment has continued. There was significant underemployment and there was substantial unemployment in minority groups and in youth groups that was quite harmful to the whole impact of manpower in our economy. And with that as the background and the need to really create and develop jobs, and the need to really educate and train people to fill those jobs, then to match the person with the job, there developed the concept of the Manpower Development and Training Act. I think it is different in concept and philosophy although it is directly tied in and works closely with, and is part and parcel of, the vocational education system. What was done then? What came out of the need to create jobs and train people and match the person with the job was a product pretty much along the lines recommended by the labor movement, by the AFL-CIO, which was amongst the first and strongest supporters of the legislation when it was presented in Congress in 1962.

It was my good fortune, as a representative of the labor movement, to testify before both the House and the Senate in support of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Little did I ever suspect then that I would end up 2½ years later as the administrator of that program along with others in the Department of Labor. But what the MDTA program did was to meld the notion of determining what kinds of jobs were currently needed or needed in the future with the concept of the educators' ability to train and prepare the worker. And with the unique feature added of a training allowance to help assure that the unemployed worker be selected to train in the occupation that the community needed trained workers; to assure that that worker remained as a trainee and didn't drop out of the training program to take the first job that came along because he needed money to support his family. The training allowance notion enabled him to continue his work, continue his training, and improve himself so that he could take a better job rather than accept any old job just because he needed money to support his family. As a result the United States Department of Labor had the first responsibility of determining reasonable expectation of employment and the Department of HEW and the vocational education people had the responsibility of carrying out the training. It then fell back to the Department of Labor, after the individual was trained, to refer him out to a job and see that he got placed in suitable employment that was directly related to the occupation for which he was trained. So the Department of Labor combined with HEW is engaged in promoting active manpower policy.

Now what is an active manpower policy? Well here are the elements of it and here's how it fits into the MDTA program. The Department of Labor as I have said has determined the need of the worker. The HEW is then asked to set up the course and to train the worker and then the Department of Labor pays the training allowance. The worker is then trained in the vocational education facility while he is receiving training allowances. He then comes back to the employment service of the United States Department of Labor, is referred out and placed in suitable labor. Throughout this whole process the law provides for MDTA advisory committees. The role of these committees, at the local and state level, is to review the projects and advise on their merits, their suitability, their needs; this is a major responsibility. The law was foresighted enough to provide and almost require the establishment of such committees. I say almost because the law wasn't specific but we have by regulation ruled there shall be advisory committees in the labor movement to review projects, and you and your associates in the labor movement have a responsibility of reviewing these projects and making sure that your recommendation, for or against, accompanies that project forward as it goes from the local level to the state level. If there is an objection to a program you, as a labor advisor on a committee, have the right to bring your objection to that program directly to the manpower administrator who is required by regulations to investigate the complaint that the project shouldn't go forward. There hasn't been one single complaint that has taken that route to the manpower administrator. Projects have been objected to, but I have not seen anybody exercise the right to take their objection straight to the manpower administrator.

The law was also foresighted enough to provide monies for experimental and demonstration projects. No one of us knows all the answers, least of all the United States Employment Service, and the vocational education system, neither system knows all the things that need to be done or are prepared to do what ought to be done fully and completely. Therefore, funds have been provided to experiment with methods of selecting, motivating and counseling the hard-to-reach individual and we have experimented with funds provided under the law with new methods and new techniques of reaching people. Now the figures are clear--there are millions of hard-to-reach people in America who need help.

This is only one aspect to the problem but a tough one and an important one that cannot be continued by maintaining the status quo and ignoring the facts. There are 17 million individuals in America with 8th grade education or less: 25% of our labor force. Amongst the non-white: 40% have an 8th grade education or less. A third of all our youth drop out of high school before they graduate. Teen-age unemployment is 12½%, and amongst the Negroes it is 25%; the unemployment rate for teen-age Negro girls is 33%. So while unemployment may be down to 4½% for the last 2 months, what people like

Charles Killingsworth have been saying for the last 2 or 3 years is still valid today: reducing the overall level of unemployment doesn't rid us of the basic fundamental problem. It doesn't resolve the issue of how to put to work the hard-to-reach people, the hard core unemployed, those with little educational attainment and with little training. They are hard to reach so we have experimented in the employment service with methods and means of improving the techniques of reaching these people. Once reached, and motivated to be trained in an occupational course, they just cannot be dumped back on to the same educational system from which they originally dropped out of school. Just as they are hard-to-reach, they are equally hard-to-teach. Therefore, you had better begin to experiment with ways of resolving that problem.

The Manpower Training and Development act with its funds, which are only limited to this, are encouraging and supporting efforts to handle the hard-to-reach and the hard-to-teach. Certainly, with the research funds available under the Vocational Education Act there are also funds to do this and I hope cooperatively we can work together to move in that direction.

But aside from that problem there are other needs and requirements of the day. MDTA is developing an intensive on-the-job training program carried on and through the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training of the Department of Labor which is an arm of the Manpower Administration. The basic objective of the on-the-job training program is to upgrade present underemployed persons thereby opening up new job entries at the bottom for the hard core unemployed. Let me illustrate for you what is being done by unions which it seems to me are the kinds of things you and your unions could do and take advantage of doing if you chose to. The first example is that of the operating engineers. The operating engineers have had a project funded by the Manpower Development and Training Act which upgrades present unskilled and semiskilled employees to be heavy road equipment operators. This program simultaneously, as it takes the semi-skilled and unskilled individual and puts him up as the heavy road equipment operator, opens up opportunities at the bottom. The operating engineers are now doing this in Colorado, West Virginia, and they are about to start doing it in Idaho, Washington, Arizona, and in Ohio. They are already doing it in California. Not all of the programs have been approved and there are only 3 operating now, California, Colorado, and West Virginia. But it is something which the unions have done and the union in this instance is the responsible training organization and this gets to a problem on which vocational education people have different attitudes in different parts of the country. But it has been generally agreed that the operating engineers have a capability of doing what they have proposed here and the contracts, therefore, have been made with the operating union as the training instructor and the training institution to carry on the program. Now another program is the barbers'. It is a program to upgrade and make hair stylists out of barbers. I never thought the day would come when the barber would have to become a hair stylist for male, not female, haircuts. Anyway, the barbers don't know how to cut that kind of hair so they are being upgraded and as the barbers are upgraded to become hair stylists the union has agreed to open up 2,000 new apprenticeship opportunities for unemployed people to move into the barber industry. This is a program which has been worked out jointly between the Manpower Administration and the union. I am picking specifically the examples we have with unions to show you the kinds and varieties of things unions can get into. And by doing this I don't want to imply to you, or even give you any slight indication, that these are the only kinds of programs we have, because obviously that is not the case.

Still another kind of program is one which we have developed to train journeymen auto mechanics by encouraging and even financially helping employers to establish apprenticeship programs. Let me briefly describe one such program with the Chrysler Motor Corporation. The Department of Labor has put $1,600,000 into the program; Chrysler Corporation is putting in 7 million dollars to the same program to train 1,000 automobile mechanics and automobile repairmen. We are paying part of the cost of the training through the first year of apprenticeship which leads eventually to an approved apprenticeship training program for automobile mechanics which the machinist union fully agreed to before the contract was agreed to with Chrysler. In other words, the standards set in the contract for apprenticeship requirements in the program are those approved nationally in your apprenticeship standards for automobile mechanics. It is a program in which individuals are given an opportunity to advance their own opportunity. I would like to mention one other similar program. It is a program being worked out with the bricklayers international union to bring in apprentice bricklayers in the city of Washington in a specific program. A program that is designed with the full approval and complete concurrence of the bricklayers international union. One other program which we developed 2 months ago in the city of Cleveland with the National Urban League and the NAACP, in cooperation with the unions in the Cleveland area, is a pre-apprenticeship program where we are qualifying competent minority individuals to pass and earn on their own the right to become apprentices. This is, in a sense, saying that many of the minority people fail to pass an apprenticeship examination because they don't quite have all the capability, all of the background. This program is designed to give them those capabilities and that background so they can move into an apprenticeship trade on their own with abilities and be considered as equals and not given special privileges in order to get minority groups into the apprenticeship program.

Now, what does all of this that I have been talking about add up to? Unemployed people need training. Underemployed people need to be utilized at their fullest potential. MDTA with the combined, unique role with the vocational education system is here to help do that and I would urge each and everyone of you to help us do the job, not only better but in a way that is helpful and not detrimental to the basic interests of the labor movement. Peter Schoemann, president of the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters, in a speech that he made before the building and construction trades legislative conference in May of this year, said: "MDTA is here to stay, make no mistake about it. It passed the Senate with amendments this year with a vote of 76 to 5; it passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 392 to 0." Now Mr. Schoemann was not saying he wanted MDTA programs in the United Association but he was saying MDTA is here because there is a great need to train people for the jobs that are required and he was urging the building trades people to do more toward increasing their own apprenticeship programs. This is fine and wonderful and we need more of it. So I say to you pitch in and see to it that MDTA is made to work, to help you and not to hurt you. The advisory committee structure is designed to give you all at the local, state, regional and national level the opportunity to do just that.

List of Conference Participants
Conference on "Labor and Vocational Education"
Kellogg Center - MSU
September 8 - 10, 1965

1. Members of State Boards and Advisory Councils on Vocational Education

R. C. Anderson
Executive Vice President
Colorado Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Room 300
360 Acoma Street
Denver, Colorado

Donald Bastemeyer
Business Agent
Omaha Carpenters District Council
1821 California Street
Omaha, Nebraska

Edwin Brown
Secretary-Treasurer
Rhode Island AFL-CIO
357 Westminster Street
Providence, Rhode Island

Ferrell Campbell
Operating Engineers Local 302
306 Willoughby
Juneau, Alaska

Lee Chapman
International Representative
International Association
of Machinists
1149 W. Monroe Street
Springfield, Illinois

Joseph F. Curtice
Executive Secretary
Washington Building Trades
Council
1745 K. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Betty Donnelly
Vice President
New York State AFL-CIO
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York

Benjamin Dorsky
President
Maine State Federation
Labor Council
199 Exchange Street
Bangor, Maine

Barbara Finkelstein
President
American Newspaper Guild
Local 173, 17-18th Avenue
Paterson, New Jersey

Gordon Flory
Executive Vice President
Louisiana AFL-CIO
P.O. Box 38
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Robert M. Gomsrud
President
International Brotherhood of
Electrical Workers, Local 292
117 S.E. 4th Street, Room 404
Minneapolis, Minnesota

George Hammond
President
AFSCME State Council 99
121 Burlington
Missoula, Montana

1. Members of State Boards and Advisory Councils on Vocational Education (Continued)

Henry Hedberg
Legislative Representative
Alaska State Federation of Labor
Box 487
Anchorage, Alaska

William Jackson, Jr.
Secretary
Trades Council
Providence Building
945 Eddy Street
Providence, Rhode Island

Joseph Kane
Business Agent
International Association of Machinists
255½ Smith Street
Providence, Rhode Island

Robert Lonaghan
Secretary-Treasurer
Pocatello Central Labor Union
Box 1574
Pocatello, Idaho

Emil Narick
United Steelworkers, AFL-CIO
1500 Commonwealth
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Norman D. Neilan
Business Manager
Carpenters Local 507
P.O. Box 221
Pierre, South Dakota

John A. Morris
Education Director
Indiana State AFL-CIO
910 N. Delaware Street
Indianapolis, Indiana

Mary Pease
Retail Clerks Local 201
742 S.E. Roberts Street
Roseburg, Oregon

Ben H. Scott
Secretary-Treasurer
Retail Clerks Local 905
23949 Belle Porte Avenue
Harbor City, California

J.C. Turner
Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO
1311 L. Street N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Robert L. Webb
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers
1101 N. Cleveland Street
Little Rock, Arkansas

John H. Winters
Business Agent
United Association of Plumbers
150 Ernest Street
Providence, Rhode Island

2. Principal Officers of State Labor Councils

Glen Armstrong
Secretary-Treasurer
West Virginia Labor Federation
1624 Kanawha Blvd., E.
Charleston, West Virginia

Emile Bourg
Louisiana AFL-CIO
429 Government Street
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Harry L. Brill
Maryland State AFL-CIO
305 W. Monument Street
Baltimore, Maryland

Edwin Brown
Secretary-Treasurer
Rhode Island AFL-CIO
357 Westminster Street
Providence, Rhode Island

Dr. John S. Carroll
Director of Education
California Labor Federation
  AFL-CIO
995 Market Street
San Francisco, California

William Davies
Educational Director
Ohio AFL-CIO
271 E. State Street
Columbus, Ohio

Joseph Davis
Washington State Labor
  Council, AFL-CIO
2700 First Avenue
Room 206
Seattle, Washington

Wallace J. Dockter
President, North Dakota AFL-CIO
Suite 1
118½ N. 3rd
Bismarck, North Dakota

Darrell Dorman
President
Idaho State AFL-CIO
Box 269
Boise, Idaho

Benjamin Dorsky
President
Maine State Federation Labor
  Council
199 Exchange Street
Bangor, Maine

Robert Gibson
Secretary-Treasurer
Illinois State AFL-CIO
300 N. State Street
Chicago, Illinois

Ruth Warren Greenberg
Director of Education
Connecticut State Labor
  Council AFL-CIO
P.O. Box 5278
Hamden, Connecticut

Vernon Harris
Treasurer
Maine State Federated Labor
  Council
199 Exchange Street
Bangor, Maine

E.T. Kirkland
Secretary-Treasurer
South Carolina Labor Council
119 S. Parker Street
Columbia, South Carolina

Francis Lavigne
Education Director
Massachusetts State Labor
  Council, AFL-CIO
11 Beacon Street
Boston, Massachusetts

2. Principal Officers of State Labor Councils (Continued)

James T. Marr
Executive Secretary-Treasurer
Oregon AFL-CIO
506 Labor Temple
Portland, Oregon

Francis K. McDonald
Secretary-Treasurer
South Dakota State
Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

R.E. McFarland
President
Alaska State Federation of
Labor, AFL-CIO
Box 487
Anchorage, Alaska

Victor G. Meyers
Educational Director
Nebraska State AFL-CIO
1821 California
Omaha, Nebraska

Wiley H. Montague
Georgia State AFL-CIO
15 Peach Street
Room 208
Atlanta, Georgia

Thomas Policastro
President
Rhode Island AFL-CIO
100 Fountain Street
Providence, Rhode Island

Alfonso Rodriques
Executive Secretary-Treasurer
New Mexico State AFL-CIO
1822 Lomas Blvd. N.E.
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Albert Root
Director of Activities
Moutana State AFL-CIO
P.O. Box 1176
Helena, Montana

August Scholle
President
Michigan State AFL-CIO
716 Lothrop
Detroit 2, Michigan

H.G. Tate
Education Director
Texas AFL-CIO
Box MM, Capitol Station
Austin, Texas

A.G. Trammell
Secretary-Treasurer
Alabama Labor Council, AFL-CIO
604 Lyric Building
Birmingham, Alabama

Joseph Walsh
Pennsylvania AFL-CIO
101 Pine Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

3. Speakers, Panel Members, Discussion Leaders, Etc.

Russell Allen
Acting Associate Director
Labor Program Service
School of Labor & Industrial Relations
Michigan State University

Walter Arnold, Director
U.S. Office of Education
Division of Vocational & Technical Education
Washington, D.C.

Edwin Brown
Secretary-Treasurer
Rhode Island AFL-CIO
357 Westminster Street
Providence, Rhode Island

Ted Connally
Research Assistant
School of Labor & Industrial Relations
Michigan State University

Nelson J. Edwards
National Advisory Council on Vocational Education
Executive Board Member at-Large,
UAW, and Member
Detroit, Michigan

Fred K. Hoehler, Jr.
Associate Director
Labor Program Service
School of Labor & Industrial Relations
Michigan State University

Fred Irwin
AFL-CIO
1200 - 15th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C.

Barbara Kemp
Program Specialist
Division of Vocational & Technical Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Owen B. Kiernan
Commissioner of Education
State of Massachusetts
200 Newberry Street
Boston, Massachusetts

J.W. Letson
Superintendent of Schools
Atlanta, Georgia

Sylvia McCollum
Program Planning Officer
Division of Adult & Vocational Research
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Louis L. McQuitty
Dean
College of Social Science
Michigan State University

George A. Parkinson
Director
Vocational, Technical and Adult Schools
1015 N. 6th Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Otto Pragan
Assistant Director
Department of Education
AFL-CIO
815 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Lawrence Rogin
Director
Department of Education
AFL-CIO
815 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Edwin L. Rumpf
Assistant Deputy Director
Division of Vocational & Technical Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

3. Speakers, Panel Members, Discussion Leaders, Etc. (Continued)

Michael Russo
Program Specialist
Division of Adult &
Vocational Research
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Stanley Ruttenberg
Manpower Administrator
U.S. Department of Labor
Washington, D.C.

Byrl Shoemaker
Director of Vocational
Education
State of Ohio
324 Acton Road
Columbus, Ohio

Jack Stieber
Director
School of Labor & Industrial
Relations
Michigan State University

Joseph Tuma
Executive Consultant
Michigan Office of
Economic Opportunity
7310 Woodward
Detroit, Michigan

Neil Vande Vord
Instructor
MSU Labor Program Service
Oakland University
Rochester, Michigan

Dr. Ralph Wenrich
School of Education
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Robert M. Worthington
Director
Vocational Education
State of New Jersey
175 W. State Street
Trenton, New Jersey

4. AFL-CIO Steering Committee on Vocational Education

Joseph Corcoran
United Association of Plumbers
& Pipe Fitters, AFL-CIO
Washington, D.C.

Paul Hutchings
Metal Trades Department
AFL-CIO
Washington, D.C.

Fred Irwin
AFL-CIO
1200 - 15th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C.

Bill Jenkins, Director
Manpower Training
UAW
8000 E. Jefferson Ave.
Detroit 14, Michigan

Matthew Kessler
International Association of
Machinists, AFL-CIO
1300 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Jack Sheehan
United Steelworkers
1001 Connecticut, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

5. Observers, Guests, Etc.

Lowell Burkett
American Vocational Association
Washington, D.C.

Samuel Burt
Upjohn Institute
Washington, D.C.

Raymond Clark
Professor
Secondary Education and Curriculum
Michigan State University

Mr. Feirer
Editor
Industrial Arts & Vocational
Education Magazine
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Ray M. Karnes
University of Illinois
347 Edue Building
Urbana, Illinois

Mil Lieberthal
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Bernard Michael
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Hubert M. Rowe
South Carolina Labor Council
119 S. Parker Street
Columbia, South Carolina

Thomas L. Scanlon
Oregon AFL-CIO
506 Labor Temple
Portland, Oregon

Bernard Yabroff
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.